REESE LIBRARY

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/methodsofsociala00lochrich

METHODS OF SOCIAL ADVANCE

METHODS OF SOCIAL ADVANCE

Short Studies in Social Practice by various Authors

EDITED BY

C. S. LOCH, B.A.

SECRETARY OF THE LONDON CHARITY ORGANISATION SOCIETY

'If citizens be friends they have no need of justice, but, tho' they be just, they need friendship or love also; indeed, the completest realisation of justice seems to be the realisation of friendship or love also.'

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

London

MACMILLAN AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1904

HN 389
.L7

REESE

PREFACE

In December 1902 a letter, here reprinted, was addressed to the *Times*, in which suggestions were made for social reform and the prevention of distress. The suggestions of the letter have since served as a kind of agenda for discussion during the present year (1903) at special meetings of the Council of the Charity Organisation Society. On most of them papers were written, and many people interested in them from different points of view took part in the debates. Afterwards it was thought that the papers would interest a yet larger audience. Accordingly they have been published in this book with some additions.

Most of the papers have appeared in the Charity Organisation Review. Each author is responsible for his own paper.

C. S. L.

157701

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	Preface	v
	Introduction: Distress and its Prevention (*C. S. Loch*)	1
I.	Out-Patient Departments and the Rearing of Children (*Edmund Cautley, M.D.*)	7
II.	The Work of a Hospital Almoner (*Helen G. Nussey, Almoner, Westminster Hospital*)	18
III.	Charitable Action in Phthisical Cases (*E. E. Mudd, Almoner, St. George's Hospital*)	29
IV.	Physical Education (*Col. O. T. Duke*)	39
V.	A Policy of Hustling; or, The Lock and Key (*J. R. Motion*)	59
VI.	Agriculture and the Unemployed Question (*H. Rider Haggard*)	64
VII.	Past Experience in Relief Works (*Helen Bosanquet*)	79
VIII.	Emigration and Want of Employment (*John Martineau*)	88
IX.	Municipal Labour Bureaux (*T. Hancock Nunn*)	96
X.	Industrial Partnership and the Prevention of Distress (*George Livesey*)	107
XI.	Apprenticeship (*Miss M. K. Bradby and Miss F. H. Durham*)	118
XII.	Wages and Housekeeping (*Helen Bosanquet*)	131
XIII.	The Separate Payment of Rates (*C. S. Loch*)	147
XIV.	Poor Law Reform (*T. Mackay*)	158
XV.	A Charities Board (*C. S. Loch*)	169
XVI.	A School of Sociology (*E. J. Urwick*)	180
XVII.	'If Citizens be Friends' (*C. S. Loch*)	189

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION

DISTRESS AND ITS PREVENTION

No small part of our indecision and failure in dealing with social difficulties is due to our lack of any clearly conceived social purpose. Our real purpose, I take it, is to make and keep our people competent. We would add to their ability, energy, and resources, strengthen their affections, and increase their pleasure in a healthy, robust existence; and, as we do this, it would follow, as the night the day, that their power of preserving their independence in all the ordinary contingencies of life and in the strain of hard times would increase proportionally.

It follows, further, that to make the people more competent our appeal must be made, not to their weakness, but to their strength, however elemental or undisciplined that strength may be. We must add strength to strength. This view is of vital importance. It affects the whole question of relief and the use of means. Relief or even increased wage or income will not help the people (of whatever class they be), but will rather weaken them, if it does not coincide with some movement on their part which makes for better social habit. In this, and not in any new form of dependence, does the remedy lie. All the experience of that long history of the enfranchisement of the poorer classes from system after system of social control and eleemosynary or statutory serfdom enforces this conclusion; and, so far as we can yet judge them by results, the experience of German, colonial, and other schemes for the new dependence of the infirm and the aged tells the same tale.

One source of life-long weakness, physical and moral, is

incompetence in the rearing of children. By this social habit is undone at its very inception. At children's hospitals, as has been said, far the larger part of the disease and sickness for which aid is sought is avoidable. But the mothering power of our womenkind is deficient. They do not know, nor do they learn, at the home, or the school, or, except in a slight degree, at the hospital, the simple facts that, above all in a crowded town, are essential to the well-being of children. If we ought to educate the people according to their real needs, should not education in social habit form a chief part of our school teaching?

Another remedy may be found in playgrounds and games for both boys and girls. Dr. Dukes has once more drawn attention to this. Municipal authorities not infrequently make clearances in central districts under Dwellings Acts. The commercial value of the sites thus cleared is written down to its 'dwellings' value—a very great loss; and dwellings are built; and, a most unnatural process, to them new settlers, usually of a superior class, are attracted, migrating to mid-London instead of away from it. Would it not be better, costly though it may seem, to use the cleared sites in part as open spaces and playgrounds, and afterwards, when by the normal outward movement of the population, the demand for school accommodation in the district decreases, to sell them at the market price? And in the ever-increasing suburbs of our large towns, why should not at least two acres be provided as playground for every new school? Or, why should not a fixed proportion of acreage be preserved for playground and recreation as the town pushes outwards? There are many means of doing this, through corporations and colleges who have building estates, through a 'national trust' like that for places of historic interest or natural beauty, or through some public body such as the Trustees of Public Reservations in Massachusetts.

Not less important as a means of preventing distress is the physical and military drill, the adoption of which Lord

Charles Beresford has urged on the Council of Education. But will not the Government go further and put before the country some well-considered proposal for the disciplining of our people as citizen soldiers? This would check hooliganism, and it would do more. It would give men and boys a larger conception of duty and new ideas as to the use of means, would harden them physically, and make them cleaner and more temperate, more adaptive and self-reliant. And, if we are to have the reservist system, should not the men be so taught and disciplined while they are on service that morally and educationally they become competent for well-paid skilled work when they leave the ranks?

Much distress might be prevented by other means also. Under safeguards not difficult to provide, the friendly society, as well as the savings bank, might be organised in the closest relation to the school system. A habit of forethought in life would thus grow up, strong enough to bear the strain of the years that follow school age, a habit which is neither ungenerous nor miserly, as it is often said to be, but which is to the soul as is a sound constitution to the body. And as the power of husbanding is usually a first step to civilisation, why should not the visitors of parochial and other agencies become collectors of savings—humble work indeed, but it enables many people, who otherwise would never think of putting by, to harvest the fruit of their labours, and it opens out to them a better life than that of hand-to-mouth hopelessness.

And we should not oppress the people with taxation. In some districts this is increasing out of all proportion to the increase either of population or of rateable value. Thus in three boroughs in different parts of London the increase per cent. between 1890–91 and 1899–1900 is as follows:—

	Total Rates	Rateable Value	Population
St. Pancras	+34·2	+13·0	+ 0·4
Poplar	+52·7	+14·6	+ 1·2
Camberwell	+66·7	+21·2	+10·2

This represents in Camberwell an increase of £219,694 on the assessment and of £210,682 on the annual expenditure. In West Ham, with an increase of 47·1 per cent. on the rateable value, the increase of expenditure on 'the relief of the poor and purposes connected therewith' between 1891 and 1900 has been 102 per cent.

These large additions to the rates combined with rising assessments are indeed a grave form of economic oppression. And how they are raising rentals and pushing industries to other districts the people do not realise. They forget that, as increased duties are as far as possible passed on to the consumer, so an increase of 1*s.* in the pound in the rate represents usually an increase of at least 2*d.* or 3*d.* a week on a 5*s.* rental. The remedy lies largely in the collection of the rates from the individual occupant. An increase in the rates will then be expressed definitely as the equivalent of so many pence collected periodically by, or on behalf of, the rate collector. And a sense of responsibility, one of the first safeguards for the good use of means and so against distress, will thus be created.

Another suggestion may perhaps be considered. Ingenuity in associative mercantile contrivance is by no means exhausted, as the history of trusts in the past year shows. Is it exhausted on the distributive side? Trade unions may aid skilled labour; they cannot benefit unskilled labour permanently. To improve his economic position the unskilled labourer must have recourse to some other method. With him progress lies in the better use of wage, or, if it can be arranged, in profit-sharing, or in similar co-operative relations between employer and employee. Sir George Livesey has shown how the employees of a gas company may become property holders. Is it not possible to extend the system to labourers generally, or at least to most of those who work at the docks and to that large group of partially casual labourers who work for different masters for sometimes long periods together? As a matter of justice, should not workers share in profits according to

some estimate of the extent to which they have helped to create them? Were this possible a new element of security would be given to life which, accruing as a reward of work done, would bring with it alike self-restraint and economic hopefulness. A reserved share of profits would be of the greatest service in the periodic depressions of trade.

In the last half-century our Poor Law system has changed in much. But two things remain. 'Ins and outs' come and go, and for them social neglect does not carry with it the penalties or the discipline of social reform. A class bordering on the Poor Law might be largely modified by even the prospect of committal for a period of laborious and wholesome detention as an alternative to 'in and outing.'

And the allowance system still reigns supreme, though, as it now is, or has to be, administered under the Poor Law, it is contrary to all the canons of charity. The key to success in charity lies in persistent care for the individual in close connection with the family and in discerning and friendly aid, according to the needs of the particular case. Few realise how great this success may be. But a statutory and rate-supported allowance system reduces all remedies to one—to the granting of money: it thus deprives the people of one most useful means of social education, the personal responsibility of charity, and it prevents any large growth of that responsibility. In these circumstances little or nothing is done to draw institutional relief into systematic relation with personal and local charity. And the endowments of our ancestors, which could be most usefully applied in close alliance with the living charities of the day, are isolated, unsupervised, and in large measure left to run to waste. Nor, if we except the special and limited powers of the Charity Commission, have we any recognised administrative centre for association and guidance in charity—a branch of social work on which the nation should be able to rely as a constant aid in the case of the disabled and worn-out and in the regeneration of those who can be saved from debasement.

Is it not worth while to consider whether a State Board of Charities modelled to suit English needs would not help us in the better supervision of charities and possibly in such problems as the treatment of inebriates, the permanent care of the feeble-minded, and in other ways?

All the impulse that charity, in its fullest meaning, religion, and personal devotion can give we want. From these come a spontaneity and originality which are curative as spring breezes. But ultimately all suggestions depend on the education of public thought. A new and, as we believe, truer patriotism now fills our hearts. There is fear lest it should be merely combative and self-assertive. If it is real it will quicken our minds and reform our organisation, and make of the warring and merely competitive elements in our nation a social whole. As this is realised, that cardinal want, education in social life and economics, will perhaps be met, and those who undertake the duties of administration or of charity will learn that to promote competence in others they must first make themselves competent, and that without intelligence and a clear purpose neither personal devotion, nor religious feeling, nor excited philanthropy, nor large communal expenditure, can prevent or remove our distress.

C. S. L.

I

OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS AND THE REARING OF CHILDREN

The object of this paper is threefold. Firstly, I wish to point out how greatly limited is the effect of the valuable work done in the out-patient departments of hospitals for diseases of children. Secondly, I desire to put forward suggestions for supplementing the purely medical work and making it of more than merely temporary benefit. Thirdly, I think that steps should be taken to co-ordinate the efforts of various charitable bodies and to direct their attention to the possibility of assisting mothers, in looking after their children, by a system of home visits. Unfortunately it is still a superstition among the poor that the only necessity in the treatment of disease is a bottle of medicine, and that anything in the nature of advice need not even be listened to. Practical demonstrations would, however, be more attractive and doubtless more efficacious.

Reference to the returns of the Registrar-General shows that the mortality of infants—that is, of children under one year of age—is absolutely appalling, and that it does not decrease with the progress of civilisation in the same way as the mortality from other preventable diseases. During the ten years, 1891 to 1900, a yearly average of 160 out of every 1,000 children born in London died under the age of one year. The mortality is even higher in some other large towns in the United Kingdom. More than two-thirds of the deaths from diarrhœa are those of infants under one year of age, and diarrhœa in infants is an affection which almost

invariably arises from errors in diet. In addition to the deaths from diarrhœa, a large number resulted from wasting or malnutrition, a condition entered in mortality statistics as marasmus or infantile atrophy. This, too, is almost invariably due to bad feeding. Apart from deaths, there are many secondary affections due to a similar cause. Notably among these may be mentioned rickets, with its resulting predisposition to fatal lung affections, to deformities, and to imperfect development. It is obvious that both imperfect development and deformities are likely, when present in the parent, to affect the transmission of the species.

There is not a shadow of doubt that on the methods of feeding and rearing infants, during the early stages of existence, depend the health and strength of the children and, in fact, the strength and physique of the nation. One is almost justified in asserting that the physique of the nation varies directly as its food supply during infancy and early childhood.

Quite half the patients brought to the out-patient departments, for ailments which come under the care of the physician, are infants under one year of age. It would be found on any day, chosen haphazard, that there would be comparatively few cases to treat if all those due, primarily or secondarily, to purely dietetic causes were excluded. In other words, diet is the main cause of illness in infants and a frequent cause in older children. On account of its overwhelming importance my observations are mainly concerned with the infants.

In treating these infants an enormous amount of energy is wasted by the experts in charge of the departments. Careful directions are given verbally, often written down and handed to the mother, and frequently supplemented by a printed pamphlet containing full details of what is required. Yet for many reasons the desired results are not obtained.

It may be stated as an axiom that the amount of benefit derived from the advice given by the physician is in inverse

ratio to the degree of intelligence possessed by the mother. Even after many years of compulsory school education the stupidity and ignorance of some mothers is astounding. And yet every mother thinks that some inborn instinct enables her to bear and rear babies successfully, without the least advice or instruction.

Put shortly, failure on the part of the mother results from one or other of three causes.

(1) *Ignorance.*—The mother is anxious to rear her infant, devotes much time and attention to it, but fails through not having the least idea how to feed a baby, or through relying on the advice of ignorant neighbours or landladies. Every woman who has brought up one baby thinks herself a competent adviser, and that she knows all about the subject.

(2) *Carelessness.*—The unfortunate child often has to take its chance, perhaps a very small one by reason of the dirty, slatternly, or drunken habits of the mother. Carelessness is most in evidence in the case of the later children of large families and among those who are insured. There is no doubt that, as a general rule, the younger children among the poor have a smaller chance of survival than the elder ones, partly because they are looked upon as superfluous, partly because of the limited means of the parents. Unconsciously, if not deliberately, less care is devoted to them.

The question of insurance is a difficult one. On the one hand, it is adopted by the respectable poor from worthy and justifiable motives; on the other, it leads to carelessness and neglect in some instances, from the fact that the insurance money will provide for an impressive funeral, and, perhaps, even a small balance. Consciously or unconsciously, on the part of the mother, the insurance of infants leads, in my opinion, to much carelessness in their management and to an increase in the mortality.

(3) *Criminal Neglect.*—The worst instances of neglect are seen in the insured and in nurse-children, the latter being

often illegitimate. It is sometimes seen in first-born children, but is more common in large families. Where neglect ceases to be carelessness and becomes criminal is an insoluble problem.

One of the most difficult questions a hospital physician is confronted with, and not an uncommon one, is to ascertain whether the infant is being deliberately starved to death from lack of food or from being fed on food which is known to be unsuitable, or is dying as the result of mere ignorance on the part of the mother or nurse. Needless to say, cases in which the infants are insured, or are 'out at nurse,' are looked upon with the gravest suspicion. It is a sad fact that there are women who have learnt the trade of 'slaughterer of the innocents' so well that the poor victim is brought regularly to the hospital, is kept beautifully clean and well clad, and is being slowly and deliberately starved to death by actual lack of food, though more commonly by being fed on a diet which is known to be unsuitable and likely to cause death from diarrhœa or convulsions. The infants are rarely kept without food, but what they receive is of as little value to them as if they were being fed on sand or stones. Such women usually weep copiously over their 'little angels,' in the presence of the doctor.

Criminal neglect is rather outside the scope of this paper. It is to be hoped that some time Parliament, in a desire to evolve useful legislation, will pass a law placing every nurse-child under a system of registration and inspection, not limiting such protective measures to those infants in the care of women who take charge of more than one infant.

That remedies should be adopted to diminish the enormous waste of infant life, and to alleviate the still greater suffering of infants and children, is as obvious as it is difficult to devise suitable ones and to set in motion the responsible authorities for initiating and carrying them out. It seems to me that the responsibility should be shared by the State, by the municipal authorities, and by the hospitals, and that it might

be supplemented with the greatest advantage by other charitable bodies.

The suggested measures are as follows :—

(1) *Printed Instructions.*—In the first place, there should be handed to the parent of each child, when the birth is registered, a short paper of instructions on the simple methods of rearing infants, great emphasis being placed on the importance of breast-feeding during the early months of life. Such a pamphlet as that used at the Belgrave Hospital for Children might be adopted. It gives simple and full instructions on both the natural and artificial methods of feeding infants and young children up to the age of three years. It has been in use there for about ten years, and has proved of the utmost benefit to all concerned. Arrangements as to the issue of such instructions must necessarily be in the hands of the State.

(2) *Milk Supply.*—The management of artificial methods of feeding infants is always much more difficult than breast-feeding and more liable to result in failure. These difficulties are much greater among the poor than among those who are better off. Certainly every poor mother should be encouraged to suckle her child. Apart from the fact that the natural food is much more likely to be suitable than an artificial one, the breast-fed infant escapes the risks incidental to all methods of hand-feeding. These risks are partly due to unsuitable food, to lack of freshness, to carelessness and lack of cleanliness in its preparation, and to dirty or unsuitable feeding-bottles.

Here, too, the State might step in and protect infant life by prohibiting the mother from undertaking any work which interfered with the due performance of her maternal functions, until the child is three months old. An exception might be made in the case of women quite unable to suckle their infants, on production of a medical certificate to that effect. At present women are allowed to return to factory work one month after confinement.

The pamphlet, recommended for distribution, contains full and simple directions about the hand-feeding of infants from the day of birth. Cow's milk is the basis of the diet. The medical profession is unanimous that the milk of the cow, suitably modified and prepared, is the cheapest and most readily available substitute for human milk, and that it is almost invariably quite satisfactory. Unfortunately, even printed directions are not always carried out, mothers being so largely influenced by flaming advertisements of the patent food-monger and by the foolish advice of friends.

A great part of the difficulty in establishing the use of cow's milk among the poor for this purpose is due to the difficulty in obtaining a supply of good milk at a reasonable cost, and in keeping it fresh in their cramped, ill-ventilated, and often insanitary dwellings. Much of the milk bought by the poor is cheap—that is, it costs little; but it lacks freshness, is inferior in quality, and often contains chemical preservatives. For these reasons it often fails as a food, and the mother then has recourse to some proprietary article. The prime necessity is to place within reach of the poor a suitable milk supply for the use of infants. Such a duty might be taken in hand by the municipal authorities.

In various places milk depôts have been established on these lines, and it is being freely suggested that municipal bodies should undertake the supply of sterilised milk or the provision of milk laboratories. Such a scheme seems to me costly, unnecessary, and outside the scope of their functions. To carry out the work of a milk laboratory efficiently would necessitate the appointment of a resident medical officer to devote all his time to the work, the modification of the milk for particular infants, and systematic weighing of each child; or the depôt would have to be run as a kind of milk-chemist's shop, the food being ordered in the form of a medical prescription by a doctor, and made up at the depôt by a trained assistant. The evolution of this scheme has arisen out of the system of feeding infants on modified milk of definite

percentage composition. This system is largely adopted in America, but, though used in this country, it has not produced all the results claimed for it, and has not made much headway. As a general rule it is not necessary.

A scheme might be developed which would enable the poor to obtain good milk at a reasonable cost, or even gratuitously in the case of the very poor, without throwing an undue expense upon the ratepayers, without tending to pauperisation, and without encouraging the neglect of breast-feeding.

I would suggest that every seller of milk should be under the direct control of the municipal body of his district, that his premises should be frequently visited, that the sources of his milk supply should be ascertained, and that the milk should be frequently analysed. In compensation for this supervision and for the benefit of the public he should receive monthly certificates as to the quality of the milk, and, if the supply is up to the required standard, the name of the seller should be placed on a list of municipal dairies at which milk can be obtained, guaranteed up to the proper standard of quality, purity, cleanliness, freshness, and freedom from chemical preservatives.

To bring such establishments into a working connection with the out-patient departments of the hospitals the authorities might provide printed forms of orders for milk on any one of these establishments, and the physicians might make use of these for such cases as they thought deserving of such assistance. Free orders would not be very largely required, while the advantage of being able to recommend to the mothers where to obtain this guaranteed milk would be enormous. At present it is only through some of the local charitable bodies that it is possible to obtain milk, and other foods, for the necessitous poor during illness. To obtain such assistance from the Poor-Law Authorities is slow, cumbrous, unsatisfactory, and often unavailing, even in cases where food is needed rather than medicine.

The scheme proposed would be much more economical than the establishment of milk laboratories. It would provide all that is really needful in the majority of the cases, and is free from many of the drawbacks which will be found to obtain if laboratories are instituted on a large scale.

(3) *Home Supervision.*—It is not, however, enough to provide a good milk supply if the mother does not know how to make a proper use of the milk when she has got it. In this respect the milk laboratory has an advantage. Here the milk is put up in bottles of a suitable size to contain milk for each feed, and all the mother has to do is to warm the food in the bottle, to put on a teat, and give it to the child. The method is charmingly simple if the food happens to suit, but no food suits every child. It is a rule-of-thumb system, and babies cannot satisfactorily be thus brought up. The mother is relieved of all responsibility, and it seems to me both wrong and foolish for municipal authorities to take over the responsibility rather than to teach the mother proper methods, which she would be able to make use of for future children, and would disseminate by advising others and by gossip among her neighbours.

Granted that a good milk supply is obtainable, the next step is to provide for teaching mothers how to make use of it by actual demonstration. Unless the mother has a considerable degree of intelligence she will not carry out the fullest directions accurately, until she has been shown practically how to do so.

To meet this difficulty there is needed a supply of efficiently trained women, not necessarily trained nurses, who will work in connection with the out-patient departments of the hospitals. Their duties would consist in visiting the homes of cases selected by the physicians, and there teaching the mothers how to keep milk and other foods from contamination, to inculcate the importance of cleanliness of all utensils used in preparing the food and of all feeding-bottles, and to show practically how the feeds should be prepared and given, and

how the child should be washed and clothed. A few such lessons would be quite sufficient in most cases, with occasional subsequent visits to see that the instructions were being properly carried out.

To a certain extent such work is undertaken by the Invalid Children's Association, on application from the doctor in charge of the patient, and by district nurses. The funds of the former are too small to enable them to do much in this respect, and the time of the latter is mainly devoted to maternity and surgical work. As a rule, too, they are not sufficiently trained in this special branch to make them very good guides.

Unfortunately, the hospitals for children have rarely sufficient funds to carry on their ordinary work without getting into debt, and in the present state of their finances they would not be justified in undertaking this additional burden. They would be the best and most appropriate bodies to carry out the scheme, for these home visitors would have to be more or less under their control, receiving directions and instructions from the medical officers of the hospital.

There are many charitable bodies in existence engaged in working for the poor, but their efforts are ill co-ordinated, and often overlap. It is greatly to the detriment of their usefulness that these bodies, some of which supply food, clothing, coal, and nursing in suitable cases, do not put themselves more in contact with the hospitals. Many of these bodies are connected with religious work, and their assistance is only available in a particular district or among a limited sect. If it is desired to obtain any such assistance for a hospital patient, the difficulty is great from the fact that very often their existence is unknown to either the medical men or the hospital authorities. Much good would be done if the work of these bodies could be made available for use in the manner above suggested.

(4) *Education.*—Ultimately the best results will arise from an advance in the education and intelligence of the poor at large. Progress is necessarily slow and almost imperceptible

in this direction, for the gradual dissemination of knowledge is a matter of years. In my own experience, at the Belgrave Hospital for Children, such a spread of knowledge of the subject has taken place in the district that mothers frequently come to obtain a copy of the pamphlet of directions for their own use or for friends. Many children, who subsequently come to the hospital for various ailments, are found to have been brought up according to these directions.

Educational authorities do good by teaching the future mothers the importance of cleanliness in the home life, in the preparation of food and its preservation, the necessity of ventilation, fresh air and exercise, and simple facts connected with the value of different articles of food. Unfortunately, school life ends early, and its teachings are to a great extent forgotten or are stifled by the handing down, from a more ignorant parent, of a variety of prejudices and superstitions.

I have treated the subject on general lines, and have left out of account the many benefits which would be derived from the establishment of a system of home visitation, by the older children and the parents. It is obvious that once such a system were in working order, and trained women in this way obtained an entrance into the homes of the poor, they would be of the greatest service in the nursing and management of older children suffering from various ailments, and that they might have an enormous influence in improving the home life by tactful advice as to cleanliness, ventilation, clothing, and exercise.

The co-ordination of educational bodies with hospitals would be also advantageous. At present they are, to a certain extent, antagonistic. School boards look with suspicion on medical certificates of unfitness of children to attend school, when their officers see the children playing about the streets as if nothing were the matter. Many evils arise from over-education among the ill-developed and under-fed children of the poor, evils which are frequently cured by simply stopping all mental work for the time being. These evils are partly due

to overstrain of an ill-nourished brain, and partly due to insufficient air and exercise. During the winter months especially, a large portion of the day is spent in school, and the atmospheric conditions of schools containing a large number of poor children are distinctly prejudicial to health, and most of the rest is spent in close, insanitary dwellings.

School teachers could assist considerably by taking careful note of the health of their pupils and by dismissing, for medical advice, those who seemed ailing or unusually inattentive to their work. Probably the only true solution of the medical aspects of education and the spread of disease by the aggregation of children in schools consists in constant supervision of the children by specially appointed members of the medical profession.

E. C.

II

THE WORK OF A HOSPITAL ALMONER

'With a view to promote the better organisation and greater usefulness of the Out-Patient Department, the House Committee have appointed an Almoner to work among the out-patients. . . . She will systematically interview the applicants for out-patient relief with a view to eliminate from among them those whose circumstances do not seem to entitle them to treatment, or who might be better provided for by a provident dispensary or by the Poor-law authorities. At the same time every applicant will be attended to at the first visit, and no patient will be subsequently rejected if the physician or surgeon in charge desires the case to be continued under treatment.

'The almoner will undertake the duty of helping the patients, so far as opportunity will allow, to obtain surgical appliances, letters for convalescent homes, or such other aid as the staff may consider them to need.'

Such is the outline of an out-patient almoner's work as sketched by the House Committee of the Hospital. It will be seen that no unnecessary restrictions were to be placed upon the work. The almoner was to endeavour to stop abuse in every direction—abuse by the well-to-do, abuse by the thriftless, and abuse by those who through ignorance or inability of any kind could not carry out the treatment necessary to recovery. How this was to be done depended in great measure upon the resources at her command.

It is evident that this work among such a number as flock to an out-patient department would be impossible single-handed, and necessarily incomplete in all circumstances. To begin in a small way, therefore, and to build up gradually a

system upon a few structural principles, was the only way open; the proof of the soundness of the principles being that the work would gradually simplify itself and so become more easy to handle.

I. Co-operation within and without the hospital was one of the corner-stones of the foundation. *Within* the hospital the endeavour was to make the medical and nursing staff, the students, and even the hospital porters, realise that any case they might take to her as apparently what they would call a 'deserving' one would have her serious consideration, however difficult the problem to be solved might be.

A rule of reporting the action taken whenever this had been done, and of explaining carefully why it did not appear possible to assist in certain cases, resulted, it seems, in the general acceptance of the belief that the post of almoner was a useful one. Cases are now not only referred to her for inquiry as to the best means of procuring assistance, but for inquiry as to ability to pay for treatment outside the hospital, or for general advice; and those within the hospital are always ready to assist her office, by giving their medical opinion, perhaps hastening an admission, supporting a decision, or in various other ways which make the work more possible than it otherwise could be.

A few examples may show more clearly than general statements what can be done by co-operation *within* the hospital.

1. A student had been much perplexed by a maternity case to which he had been called. The husband was out of work, there was no fire or food, and many children. He asked for a visit, which proved the case to be one for the Poor Law. The man was sent to the Relieving Officer and a nurse asked to visit every morning through the clergy.

2. A girl from the country had to attend the hospital daily for the light treatment for lupus, but could find no suitable lodging. She was finally referred by the doctor to the almoner, who put her into communication with the Travellers' Aid Society. A room for

her was found at a girls' home, and here she remained comfortably for six months.

3. A servant had been practically cured of lupus by the light treatment, but needed convalescent treatment at the seaside to complete the process. Her mistress had offered to pay for her, but did not know where to send her or how to set about the arrangements. The case was sent to the almoner by the doctor, and she undertook the necessary preliminaries.

4. A man had been an in-patient with compound fracture of the leg. He had been sent by the hospital for convalescent treatment, and on his return attended daily for massage. He had a wife and two children, was in serious want and obliged to contemplate going into the infirmary. The massage nurse sent him to the almoner, who referred him to the Charity Organisation Society. He was assisted by a weekly allowance for fifteen weeks while he received the massage, till he was fit for work again.

5. A boy attended with chorea. The father was out of work, and there was insufficient food. The parents were advised to send him to the infirmary, but they refused. The case was reported to the physician, who also urged the infirmary and refused to treat the child at the hospital. A friendly visit was made later by a member of the Charity Organisation Society to see whether the parents had consented to let the lad go. It was found they had not, and he was worse. They finally promised to allow him to go.

6. A youth attended as out-patient, and was found to be suffering more from want of food than anything else ; he seemed also to be slightly wanting in intelligence. He was brought to the almoner by the doctor. It was found he had walked from Leicester in search of work. He was advised to go to the Church Army, and his parents were communicated with. The reply came at once in the shape of a very grateful letter. They said the lad had been out of work and had suffered from depression and religious mania in consequence. They were quite willing and able to support him, and sent his fare, asking that he should be sent home, and promising to exert themselves to find employment for him.

These examples show the necessity of having someone in the out-patient department whose duty it is to attend to the social aspect of a patient's life ; they also show how impossible this would be unless she was in close touch with those outside

the hospital who have the improvement of the condition of the poor at heart. The almoner is the connecting link between those who are working for the benefit of the poor within and without the hospital. Further examples would be tedious. Suffice it to say that the more the almoner knows of the conditions under which the working classes live, their thrift agencies, their wages and the workers who are doing good or harm among them, the more useful she can be, and the more co-operation she can obtain inside and outside the hospital walls the more benefit will accrue to the work of all parties concerned. Without this co-operation, if she took her work seriously, she would be filled with despair, or if she took it lightly she would make it a farce.

II. Another fundamental principle closely connected with the above is that the creation of the almoner's office should not be the creation of a new centre for the distribution of relief. All moneys entrusted to her are given in conformity with the principle of co-operation, and the patients themselves do not know there are any funds at her disposal. This at once places patient and almoner upon equal terms, and truth is possible between them. A curious example of this was given a short time ago. An old woman attended as a new patient and was advised to get a belt—cost about a guinea. She stated she was living in one room at 3*s*. a week upon what her daughter, who was abroad, could afford to give her. It was evidently true she was living in a very humble way, and she professed herself quite unable to provide what was needed. It was explained to her that, though the hospital could not give the belt, she could apply to the Charity Organisation Society, who, after making some inquiries, might be able to obtain assistance. Upon this it came out that the daughter was the wife of a solicitor in Belgium, and the old lady said she would apply to her first. If *she* could not manage to pay for the belt, she would return to the almoner for the address of the District Office. Nothing more was heard of her.

Many and various have been the engagements such as this between almoner and patient, but the principle works well by throwing the applicants for relief upon their own resources, and when it is understood that the rule applies equally it becomes appreciated, at all events by the better sort among them.

A woman who came to pay her last instalment for convalescent treatment for her little girl was evidently hurt that she should have had to struggle and deny herself much to pay 5*s*. a week for the child, when a boy who went by the same train had announced he was going away free. The apparent injustice of the facts rankled in her mind, but it had only to be explained that there was a just principle behind to send her home happy in the thought that she had managed to pay entirely herself, and there had been no necessity to ask any Society for assistance.

III. This brings us to a third principle. The almoner's endeavour throughout the work is to encourage habits of thrift and self-reliance in all who pass through her office. It is not only pointed out to those in difficulties how they can in future make some provision for the emergencies which will inevitably appear in the course of their lives, but the present need is, as far as possible, met by suggestions as to how it may be possible to manage without having to ask strangers for help. The mother of a family may refuse to come into hospital, when it is necessary for her health that she should do so, because she has no one with whom to leave the children. A talk over ways and means often results in her resolve to do a little organisation on her own account among her relations.

A boy, a few days ago, needed a new artificial eye, and the mother said she intended to get Surgical Aid letters for it as she had done before, but after it was made clear that it would be more satisfactory to save up weekly for it herself she decided to do so, and the instrument maker reports that patients return to him for small articles, such as elastic

stockings and trusses, ready to pay for them themselves, having been taught in the first instance to save up for them by paying the cost in instalments through the hospital.

The same principle of discountenancing any schemes for obtaining what is needed which may weaken a patient's moral fibre underlies the almoner's attitude to the Poor Law. Cases come before her which are on the border-line of the Poor Law, but which, unless there is some definite reason, she does not recommend to apply to the relieving officer. Single men, unable to work, who have made no provision for sickness are not urged to go into the infirmary. It seems better that they should feel the pinch due to their own neglect. It is disheartening to find how many ne'er-do-weels look upon the Poor-law infirmary as a safe provision for them in times of sickness. One of these, on being asked what he should do without a club if he fell really ill, replied 'I shall go where better men than I have gone, miss—to the infirmary,' and this is the attitude usually taken up by the thriftless. They even come to the hospital with the purpose of obtaining certificates for the infirmary, which I am glad to say they do not get unless the case is one of some urgency.

There *are* occasions, however, on which the almoner recommends resort to the Poor Law. If a man is suffering with advanced phthisis, especially if he is living in one room with a family of small children, every effort is made to send him into the infirmary. If a lad who has just left school and is suffering from epilepsy and mental deficiency is beginning a loafing life, trouble is taken to get the Guardians to send him to an epileptic colony; or if a child cannot get proper attention at home because the father is out of work, the case not being suitable for admission to hospital, the parents would be urged to apply to the relieving officer. Where the safety of the community is threatened, therefore, or where the patient is unable to protect himself, the Poor Law is brought into use; otherwise the ragged regiment is

left to seek its aid or not as necessity may dictate. Bad character is not, from the hospital point of view, a reason pure and simple for referring cases to the Poor Law, and this partly for the cause given above, and partly on account of the fact that the hospital is a medical school and every type of case should be seen there.

IV. A fourth principle now comes into prominence. It is that the almoner, and through her the patient, must recognise the true function of the hospital out-patient department—viz. the alleviation of disease which can be more suitably treated there than elsewhere. As far as possible it should be the *consulting centre* for the poor. In this way only can the best cases be procured, and in this way only can the work of the staff be sufficiently lightened to enable them to have the necessary time for teaching. With this object in view, the patients are encouraged to bring their doctors' cards ; they are also encouraged to go back to their doctors to report what has been done for them at the hospital. When a patient comes with a passport from a general practitioner the inquiry by the almoner is merely made with a view to finding out whether he is in a position to carry out all the treatment advised. Let us take as an example a man sent up by his doctor and found to be suffering from early phthisis. A great deal of organisation will probably be necessary to obtain the open-air treatment for him. The patient's name is put down for a sanatorium, and during the interval before he can be admitted he is perhaps sent to a convalescent home or into some special hospital, only coming to the out-patient department from time to time to see how he is progressing.

A child is sent by her doctor to the orthopœdic department, and an expensive instrument is recommended. The parents learn that the almoner will obtain a Sunday Fund letter for them through their clergyman, and that they may pay the rest of the cost in small instalments weekly, thus dispelling a difficulty.

For the same reason it is carefully explained to those who are refused treatment that if, at a future date, they may need *special* treatment of any kind, they are at liberty to attend again, but that the hospital is not for cases which can be equally satisfactorily dealt with outside. Patients who attend for special treatment are likewise told they must not expect to be allowed to do so for every complaint from which they may suffer. That it is possible for the poor, even the very poor, to provide for themselves for the ordinary ills of life is, I think, shown by the fact that in country parishes, where there are no hospitals, they do so as a matter of course by joining Friendly Societies and Provident Dispensaries. More stringent measures adopted by the hospitals generally would, I am convinced, result in an improved public opinion among the poor in the towns upon this point.

The part of the work which is most open to criticism is, I think, the inquiry work. It is impossible to check every statement made in an almoner's office, and at first sight it must appear that the almoner's post is merely encouraging deceit on this account. I think the results of the work as so far ascertained do not lead to this conclusion. The character of each patient must be taken into consideration as he is dealt with. For every *one* who plans a deliberate deception there are, roughly, *ten* or *twelve* who will give the truth when they understand that definite statements must be made instead of the vague generalities with which they had hoped to get through the inquiry; and of those who do deliberately plan deceit there is a still smaller proportion who have grasped the fact that 'ars est celare artem'—they do not deceive artistically. The almoner interviews from twenty to twenty-five patients daily, and a few years' experience in dealing with these numbers must, I think, if she is ever ready to correct impressions, be of even greater value to her than the power to make a full inquiry in each case with which she has to do.

Another safeguard to this branch of the work lies in the

general tone of the out-patient department. The attitude of mind of the patients generally towards the almoner's office has, I am convinced, an untold influence upon the statements made in her room. If she can establish the belief that her work is not one of oppression, but an endeavour, however faulty, to deal justly, she has gained the confidence of those with whom she has to deal, and those who practise deceit through weakness rather than through wickedness are no longer afraid to trust her openly. The proof, I think, that the almoners are not living in a fool's paradise with regard to this point is made by statistics. Take as an example the loan system adopted to enable patients to obtain what is needful at once. Sixty-nine patients were assisted in this way at Westminster last year, and of these only two were bad debts, to the extent of 6*s.* 3*d.* between them; while £38. 13*s.* 9*d.* was paid in in small sums weekly. I think this is proof that the majority of the patients mean to deal honestly by the hospital. By far the larger proportion were trusted absolutely. Their addresses might have been false and their references might have been false, but it appears to me that the way in which they responded to the trust reposed in them is one of the most hopeful signs that—though we cannot be too much on our guard against weakly allowing ourselves to be taken in—the patients on the whole do not come to the hospital with the idea of cheating it. Further proofs of this are of daily occurrence. It is not once only that a patient has handed over his prescription paper to the almoner on her telling him she considered he ought not to have come, in order that she might see that he did not wish to 'impose upon the hospital' by taking away his medicine, though he was entitled to it as part of the 'first treatment.' Patients judged able to pay constantly ask to be allowed to 'put something in the box,' and there are numbers who only need to have their duty pointed out with regard to provision for medical treatment in the future to prevent them from making a new application later on for treatment for slight

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ailments. The insistence on the point that it is the medical aspect of the case upon which eligibility for treatment is based makes deception frequently unnecessary—where is the advantage of denying that the family income is £2, or even more, when the case needs a specialist's careful watching, or some delicate operation has to be performed?

And now the question arises 'Are the results of the work such as to justify the assumption that the principles upon which it is based are good ones?' It is difficult to judge of results, because an event has usually a multiplicity of causes. We can therefore only look for signs of the times and cautiously make deductions.

(*a*) The mass number of out-patients has gone down at Westminster since an almoner has been appointed, but the number attending the special departments has gone up.

(*b*) The dispensers lately complained that their work had become heavier, though the number of out-patients was smaller, because special prescriptions had more frequently to be made up.

(*c*) The number of patients who bring their doctors' cards is increasing, particularly in the special departments.

(*d*) Out of twenty out-patient 'books' taken at random from the shelf, three cases were for admission, one was to be watched with a query as to admission later on, one was to be X-rayed, two were sent up for special advice, three were for operation, four needed prolonged treatment (one being locomotor ataxy, and one tubercular knee), one was evidently a puzzle, and five only needed no particular consideration.

(*e*) A surgeon remarked recently that his cases which needed watching have attended very much more regularly of late.

(*f*) The social status of those who attend is gradually becoming what it should be—that of the respectable poor. A residuum of unhelpable people will no doubt always continue to attend, but out of a total of 102 cases referred to the Charity Organisation Society for assistance last year, 72

were recommended by them, and of the remainder only 10 not recommended on the score of bad character or thriftlessness. (This statement is discounted to some extent by the fact that an almoner knows more or less what cases not to refer to them.)

If these facts can be claimed as results, it seems that they are worthy of consideration; for though the scheme cannot claim to have solved the vexed question of out-patient abuse, it appears to be working for the best interests of the hospital, the general practitioner, and the patient himself.

H. G. N.

III

CHARITABLE ACTION IN PHTHISICAL CASES

May I begin by assuming that most of us are discontented with the result of our work in organising efficient treatment from first to last for a case of consumption, for so few of these cases seem to justify our large expenditure on them? If we are not discontented or disheartened, then I think we ought to be, for, on the whole, we get very bad results, and I think it is very much our duty to consider if it be not in our power to do better in future, and also to stimulate other workers amongst the poorer classes to do likewise.

As discouragement, up to a certain point, is an excellent spur towards improvement or success, I will quote from a sufficiently discouraging letter from Dr. Arthur Latham, who, it will be remembered, was the winner of the King's Prize which was recently given for the best essay on 'The Erection of a Sanatorium for Consumptives.' He says:—

Sanatorium treatment for the poor is on rather a different footing to sanatorium treatment for the rich. Personally, I am convinced that it is absolutely necessary for poor people who have had the disease brought to a quiescent stage, and so apparently arrested, to be assisted to live under open-air conditions for at least two years after leaving the sanatorium if they are to get permanently well. Dr. Walther of Nordrach, in a recent letter to me, says 'that if you send a patient of this class to a sanatorium and allow him to return to his former conditions of life, at the end of a few months he dies at an earlier stage than if you leave him alone in his home.' Dr. Walther's experience is very great.

Sanatorium treatment for the poor necessitates a more or less complete change of life after the patient leaves the institution if this form of treatment is not to fall into disrepute.

Now I think this is sufficiently discouraging to make us buckle on our armour and see that it be not through any fault of ours that our patient is not able to maintain the improvement made while under sanatorium treatment.

For now we have got far beyond the time when it was held that there was no possible chance of cure for a consumptive of the poorer class. This was when the well-to-do were given all that care, comfort, and a warm sedative climate could do to prolong their lives or keep the disease in a quiescent stage. But we have only to visit the cemeteries of the south-west and south of France and Italy to see that this extreme care to guard a consumptive patient from any breath of cold wind was often in the end unavailing even for the rich. Only isolated medical men, prior to forty years ago, held any ideas of the curability of the disease, and in England their ideas met with the derision and abuse that is the fate of very many pioneers in Science.

How far have we of late years increased our knowledge of the origin and better means of treating this disease? Since 1865, when it was discovered that it could be transmitted to animals by inoculation, the progress has been steady. Dr. Koch in 1882 declared it to be an 'infectious disease,' due to a bacillus, and Sir John Simon in 1887 classified it as a 'filth disease.'

Further we now know that, although this bacillus is extremely virulent, it is perhaps the easiest of all to combat. It cannot exist in pure air and sunlight, and on the other hand, it thrives in dark, ill-ventilated surroundings. In its moist state, *i.e.* in the sputum of the consumptive patient, it does not infect the air, but in its dry state it is extremely dangerous. The patient is therefore, in all but the earliest stages, a source of danger to people living with him, by reason of what he coughs up. The bacilli in his sputum,

when dry, are even capable of growing in an ordinary temperature on wall papers, or in the dust of the room. They will remain active for some months in the presence of organic matter in dark, ill-ventilated rooms; whereas, in pure air and sunlight, they have lost their virulence almost before the sputum is dry.

Tuberculosis, therefore, is unlike most infectious diseases, and it should be comparatively easy to prevent the spread of it. Absolute cleanliness does so much towards this that its infectivity was doubted, until it was proved by Koch to be infectious. It is, therefore, a PREVENTABLE disease, and not necessarily hereditary. What then are the predisposing causes? They are these:—

A bad state of health either inherited or brought about by overcrowded, stuffy, ill-ventilated rooms, or by insufficient or bad food, intemperance or illness; and it is contracted by persons in a debilitated condition taking into their system the germ of the disease. But for the healthy, living under favourable conditions, there is little or no fear of infection.

Now what does sanatorium treatment mean?

It is to provide perfect sanitation or cleanliness in every detail; pure air; good food and regular medical attendance. Dust and organic matter are most injurious to the phthisical patient. The one excites his cough and the other lowers his vitality; therefore dust is carefully removed and avoided. And as the patient is always liable to further infection, scrupulous cleanliness is observed in order to render this impossible.

Good food is also of the first importance in sanatorium treatment, for the chief point of this treatment is to improve the health of the patient by every possible means, so that he may be able to resist the disease, and may get strong enough to maintain his improvement, and prevent a future relapse.

Regular medical supervision is at this point of the

disease—viz. in its acute or febrile stage—absolutely necessary to watch and regulate the patient's movements.

Seeing, therefore, what are the chief points aimed at in the treatment at the sanatorium, and roughly understanding its common-sense reasons, I think it will not be difficult for us to understand Dr. Walther's and Dr. Latham's remarks on the after-treatment of the consumptive poor.

Our patient, we see, is at first in a debilitated state of health. Therefore, while he is waiting for admission to a hospital or sanatorium, he must have all we can give him of good food and rest; and fresh air must be advised or enforced. But on his return we must be sure he is coming to a home free from insanitary conditions, one capable of through ventilation and light, and we must see that he has plentiful and good food until such time as he may be able to provide this for himself. For why? The treatment he has received has not always been continued long enough to arrest the disease completely, or even if it be said to be arrested, the damaged or weakened lung will want some humouring to prevent it from again breaking down; otherwise we risk losing all the good he has gained, and the money expended is wasted. So if we are to avoid the possibility of being told that we may bring sanatoria treatment for the poor into 'disrepute,' we shall have to expend plenty of thought, organisation, and perhaps some considerable amount of money, on each individual case. As, however, each case will be different, there is certainly much scope for original thought and action.

And although we must contemplate the possibility of moving whole families and procuring different work for the bread-winners, I do not think we need be much dismayed, for if our work be good, good results will follow, and help will eventually come from outside to lighten the task.

Let us for a moment consider why England, which was probably the first to erect special hospitals for the treatment of consumption—viz. the Royal Sea-bathing Hospital at

Margate in 1791, and Brompton in 1814, &c.—is now so far behind in sanatoria? The reasons are obvious. Even where the patient is admitted free or by subscriber's letter, he has to wait for sometimes from three to four months and more, and the average duration of his stay is from six weeks to two months, a period quite insufficient to be of permanent good. On leaving he goes out to any sort of home surroundings; no care is taken to draft him to a country sanatorium, and he can seldom be re-admitted within the year.

In contrast to this France has, besides other sanatoria, two for consumptive boys and youths, where the patient remains until he has recovered. In connection with these are two agricultural colonies to which the patients are afterwards drafted.

But it is in Germany where the movement against tuberculosis has been most thorough and comprehensive. The rapid progress there was due in the main to the Act passed in 1889 for the compulsory insurance against sickness and for old age of all whose incomes were under 2,000 marks, or £80 a year. This Act contained a clause permitting sick clubs and insurance societies to devote part of their funds to the treatment of their sick in lieu of sick pay. As it was found that half the applications for sick pay between the ages of twenty and twenty-nine were from patients suffering from tuberculosis, it was natural that these societies should devote much of their funds to the hygienic treatment of that disease. So completely have results proved a gain in economy to these societies, and, needless to say, an inestimable gain to the working strength of the poor, that the movement for the 'Fighting of Tuberculosis' has now universal support not only from legislative committees, sick benefit societies and insurance companies, but from a sanatoria society under the patronage of the Empress, from trade societies, from large employers of labour, as well as from private charities. And so convinced is public opinion of the

necessity of preventive methods, that already much has been done by means of legislation, in State and private buildings, and in the supervision of employments for young, growing members of the working classes.

This movement has covered Germany with a network of sanatoria, and Germans proudly boast they are before any civilised country in this undertaking. And the results justify their large expenditure and show an economic gain, for the recruiting strength of the labouring classes is between the ages of fifteen and sixty, and it has been proved that tuberculosis makes its heaviest inroads on persons between these ages, babies in arms and aged people being practically immune.

In the autumn of 1902 there were already in Germany fifty-seven free or societies' sanatoria and sixteen large private establishments, besides others in course of erection or nearly finished. They have already 7,000 beds, and can even now treat 30,000 patients yearly. Thus they are becoming more and more able to relieve society of a source of infection and also of the burden of supporting patients permanently unfit for work. There is, too, a further movement in Germany in favour of model villages.

Therefore, although advocating much more individual work on cases, we need not necessarily think we are making our tasks impossible of accomplishment, for with Germany so far ahead we cannot fail to follow. It is to our great discredit that our country, once foremost in sanitation, and, I suppose, the richest country in the world, should be so far behind in so real a want as this. But it is often the British character to wait doggedly for others to make the advance. Let us hope, then, that soon, like the tortoise, we may overtake the hare.

In October last a deputation was sent by our large friendly societies to Germany to visit some of their sanatoria and learn something of their methods. This deputation represented some five million members, with £30,000,000 funds. Up to the present these societies have been giving

sick pay, half pay, and superannuation money, without any effort to procure adequate treatment for their consumptive members, which mode of procedure must be, to say the least, economically wrong. We will trust, then, that this visit of friendly society representatives to Germany will result in some definite movement to benefit their members, and so lighten the large demands on private charity.

A proposal to establish an agricultural colony in England is, I believe, being considered by a large sanatorium which has its own farm and dairy attached. The labour on this is to be recruited from the sanatorium for poorer patients.

Finally, then, with some such hopes for the future, Dr. Latham's warning will not make lay-workers quite hopeless of any good resulting from their efforts to combat this disease amongst the poor. But all the more, it behoves us to deal thoroughly ourselves with every consumptive case passing through our hands, and much in the following manner:—

It is not possible to particularise, as the circumstances of every case will be different. But while the patient is waiting for admission to a sanatorium we must visit the home frequently to see that he is keeping out of doors, if able; and we must also take care that he is having good and sufficient food. If we ourselves are sure about the main points of sanitation, it will not be difficult for us to impart our knowledge to others in an interesting way. The poor spit everywhere, and, especially when at home, in the fireplace. It is easy to explain to them in simple language what has been the outcome of this filthy habit; what has been the result of it to themselves, and how they are endangering the healths of others.

For, again, England is scandalously behind other enlightened countries in making expectoration in public places a punishable offence. We are often more tenacious about the liberty of the individual subject than observant of the good of the majority.

To return to the home, it is simple to explain to the

housekeeper how sweeping a room only disturbs the dust, and how the copious use of tea-leaves or damp sawdust will help to collect it; and how wiping with damp cloths wrung out is preferable to dusting, &c., &c. We must also explain about ventilation and judge if it be advisable for a patient to return to the rooms he is in, even after they are disinfected, cleansed and whitewashed as they should be. If new rooms are procured, these should be properly cleansed before occupation, and other sanitary arrangements looked to.

And as we see that good nourishing food is of so much importance in the building up of a debilitated body—and its importance cannot be exaggerated—we must look to it that our patient has this; and again, most emphatically, he must not return to unsuitable, ill-ventilated, dust-accumulating, and dark rooms.

Do not let us undertake to begin to help a case if we intend to permit this; our idea is to cure our patient, not, as Dr. Walther says, to hurry his death. Those of us who are particular about ventilation, know how really painful it is to be even a short time in a close room, and how our heads soon ache, and how often afterwards we have a sore throat.

To a tubercular patient, who has become accustomed to pure air in the Sanatorium and who will never probably be strong enough to do without plenty of it, it is all-important that in every way his surroundings should be favourable to his gradual improvement. And we must look to the suitability of his employment. Employments that put too great a strain on the weakened lung, and those that necessitate the patient being in ill-ventilated, dusty workshops, are unsuitable. Before going to a sanatorium he or she must understand this thoroughly, and must consent to try some other work on leaving. Where a single man is dealt with it would be advisable for him to live an out-door life in the country. This, of course, is advisable for all, but it is not always feasible.

I am sure I shall be told that I am suggesting impossibilities. I do not think so. Nothing is impossible. But I would suggest, in order to facilitate matters, that, after the preliminary inquiry, one visitor should take the case in hand and be responsible for it. This responsibility will greatly develop originality and initiation. Our patient has to be regularly visited for some little time after his cure. After one has walked in the Valley of the Shadow of Death and been with others also in that Valley of the Shadow, one is likely to be nervous at any idea of falling back. Besides, too, a consumptive patient is often a little rash. He will have found a friend in this special visitor, who will know if some little extra food or only encouragement be necessary.

On the other hand, it is no use keeping a patient for months and months at a sanatorium if he shows no definite or sustained improvement; he must then be referred to the Poor Law. If he refuse to avail himself of the Infirmary, we can still help, by our better knowledge of the rules of sanitation, to prevent his family suffering in consequence.

And we must remember we are in the infancy of our knowledge of how to adequately help a consumptive case, and so not be discouraged. In our failures we are still doing much ultimate good; and every family taught something of the laws of hygiene means healthier descendants; and the health and power of resistance of the British race has a great deal to do with our past, present, and, we hope, future greatness.

TYPE OF CASE CARRIED OUT ON THE LINES SUGGESTED ABOVE.

G. C., 36, labourer, attended St. George's Hospital in March 1901. He was then totally unfit for work. By the help of C.O.S. he was procured admission in Dr. Jane Walker's Cottage Sanatorium at Clare, going there early in June. He was at this time living in two stuffy ill-ventilated rooms, and his wife and three children were all in ill-health, the baby particularly being wizened and wasted. During the wait for his admission to Clare he was frequently visited, and was enjoined to sit about in the Court-yard or on the Thames Embankment, which was close. The value of nourishing food, rest, and fresh air was explained to him. As soon as he left home his wife was persuaded to attend the hospital, and she and her baby soon began to show great improvement. Next, the manager of the Dwellings was seen, and was induced to give these people three better rooms. On the husband's return in September, he thought it advisable to keep one room for himself, so that he could continue to sleep with open windows. Light work was given him by St. George's Vestry, in a fairly open space, and he was seen regularly and told to come immediately to the hospital if he felt the least falling back. At Christmas he fancied it would be advisable to do still lighter work for a time, and through the recommendation of the Physician this was given him.

He has steadily put on weight ever since, but he has always carefully adhered to the doctrine of good air and good food. He now, at the end of two years, looks the picture of health, and has lately been asking for a certificate to say he is fit for ordinary labouring work.

I consider the success of this case is due to the attention that has been paid to small details, for after his return from the Sanatorium he needed constant care and watching.

E. E. M.

IV

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

I MUST confess that when, some little time ago, I received a letter from your Secretary requesting me to address the Council of the Charity Organisation Society on the subject of Physical Education, I found myself face to face with two puzzles.

Firstly, as to why the Charity Organisation Society should be called upon to consider this question at all; and secondly, if good reason could be shown for its so doing, why myself in particular should be selected as its exponent. A little reflection showed me that, as the main object of the Society is 'the improvement of the condition of the poor,' there is in this connection a wide and important field for its energies. This field, it is true, covers the whole of the United Kingdom, and the efforts of the Charity Organisation Society are limited to the metropolitan area; there is nothing, however, to forbid it from within the boundaries of the metropolis setting a beneficent example to the rest of the country.

In regard to the second of the puzzles to which I have alluded—namely, why you asked me to speak here to-day—I know that there are hundreds of men who are infinitely more fitted by special knowledge—by knowledge acquired in a life-long devotion to this particular object, or by an intimate acquaintance with the machinery by which alone physical education can be developed; for instance, the name of Mr. Horsfall, of Macclesfield, at once occurred to me—but Mr.

Horsfall is far off, and is, moreover, overwhelmed with the labours involved by the great and important reforms to which he is seeking to give practical effect in the northern districts. However, the Council of the Lads' Drill Association thought that if the authorities of the Charity Organisation Society wished me to address them, I ought to do so. Nevertheless I am here to-day with very much the same feelings as must on a certain occasion have swelled the bosom of a quondam chaplain of a former Archbishop of Canterbury. That prelate never sent out a letter or document unchecked or uncriticised. One day he had been making a special literary effort, and turning to his chaplain he handed him the manuscript, remarking as he did so, 'I always like my letters looked through, and it is a curious fact that I often get the best suggestions from the stupidest people; I wish you would examine this letter and give me your opinion on it.' Ladies and gentlemen, I must own that for the present moment you stand for the reverend prelate, I for the chaplain.

A dissertation of the kind I have undertaken must naturally first take cognisance of the physical condition of the youth of Great Britain. I will ask you, *in limine*, to allow me to assume that it is an established truth that physical is not less important than intellectual education—that, in short, a waked-up, active alert body, vigorous and healthy and normally developed, is the necessary complement of the trained and educated intellect which must be possessed by the modern citizen if our country is to maintain its position in the Commonwealth of Nations, this being of course the antithesis of the once popular creed that as with horses, so with men, the real everyday work of the world is done by the screws. This question of physical training is then essentially a question of the hour; yet, nevertheless, a wide purview of the conditions of the problems connected with it cannot but involve some retrospective inquiry, and some attempt at comparison between the present condition

of our school children of to-day with those of past generations.

For some months past everywhere in the press, and within the last few days in both Houses of Parliament, this burning question has been asked, has been mooted and discussed—Are the children of these islands degenerate?

For a long time we have discomforted ourselves with the belief that from an educational, intellectual, and perhaps moral point of view we are, if not degenerate, then at any rate in an unregenerate condition. Our golden youth has been graduating in sports, and our people have not been taught what it is vitally necessary for them to know. The whole country has indeed been convulsed by our efforts to remedy the defects in our educational machinery.

The Scotch Commission on Physical Training has clearly established the principle that physical, moral, and intellectual training must advance hand in hand; and we have not been without candid friends to tell us how far we have been astray in these matters. Did not the late Mr. W. E. Gladstone not so very many years ago inform the world, premising that he spoke as a pure Scotsman, that the English race is a great factor in the world, but that no race stands in greater need of discipline in every form, and among other forms that which is administered by criticism vigorously directed to canvassing its character and claims? He was good enough to console us by stating his belief that under such discipline the race is capable of a great elevation and of high performances.

Did not the bearer of Mr. Gladstone's mantle state the Scotch idea in more definite terms? It is scarcely three years since Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, addressing the Scotch people at Broughty Ferry in favour of educational reform, asked his audience to compare the average German, the average American, and the average Swiss with the average Englishman. He also was careful, *en parenthèse*, to invite his listeners to comfort themselves with the feeling that at all

events Scotsmen are better than Englishmen; and having made this reservation, so soon to be seriously questioned, he boldly asserted that the average Englishman is far below the Yankee, or the German, or the Swiss, or even the Frenchman—not in his character, not in the man himself, but in the way his faculties had been educated, and the way he had been trained to think and judge for himself. So much for our candid friends at home; from abroad during the past four years, from cauldrons seething with enmity, a stream of molten and venomous depreciation has been poured on us, and it is therefore with some anxiety that we come to ask, What about the man himself?—the Englishman whom Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is good enough to admit as being in the matter of his manhood not much inferior to a Scotsman—is the Englishman physically degenerate? Aye, we will carry the war into our critic's country and ask, Is the Scotsman of to-day degenerate? On this day last week, armed with facts and figures culled from the 638 pages of evidence collected in the report of Lord Mansfield's Commission and with statistics available in England—notably some valuable information given by Mr. Horsfall—Lord Meath and the Bishop of Ripon asked this question of the Government. Ministers could give no comprehensive reply; they agreed to consult the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and appeared to be disposed to appoint a Royal Commission to carry out a programme of inquiry which they would look to these learned bodies to suggest.

The Government is in fact committed to a physical census of the people and the definition of a physical standard with which comparison can be made; hence a final report cannot be looked for for many a long day, perhaps not for years.

This is, of course, the epoch of inquiry by Governments, of inquiry with limitations, but fortunately for the domestic future of this country there is a great deal of effective local government and of voluntary agency, and by the time a

Royal Commission on Deterioration has prepared its report, the common sense of the country will, it may be hoped, have insisted on a complete and vigorous enforcement of the recommendations of the Scotch Commission, and local bodies will, I venture confidently to anticipate, have advanced considerably on the road to reform.

Take, for instance, this vastly important matter which we are now considering—namely, the physical condition of the children in the elementary schools; the making of this inquiry lies, and will lie, absolutely within the power of the 332 educational bodies already established in England, and those which will shortly be created in the metropolitan area. Lord Meath, as Chairman of the Lads' Drill Association, in May last addressed the Chairmen of these bodies throughout the country; he forwarded them copies of the Scotch recommendations, and amongst other points urged them to commence at once a physical examination of all the children in the elementary schools. There are a great many members of the C.O.S. who could do not a little in support of this necessary work. Lord Meath wrote :—

> It seems to my Association of the greatest importance that reliable data in regard to the physical deterioration which there seems every reason to believe is taking place amongst the children of the poorer classes of the country should be systematically collected with a view if possible to its arrest.

The foreshadowed granting of a Royal Commission is a practical admission on the part of the Government that a *primâ facie* case as to deterioration has been established. The verdict of the Scotch Commissioners on this point was, in a way, an open one, or perhaps, rather, it should be described in regard to the whole of the charge as the Scotch one of 'Not proven.' Their unanimous opinion was expressed as follows :—

> We are not called upon to arrive at a decision as to whether or not there exists a progressive deterioration of the slum population of Great Britain or of the inhabitants of its large towns as a

whole. We find evidence that, whatever may be the case with the population as a whole, there exists in Scotland an undeniable degeneration of individuals of the classes where food and environment are defective, which calls for attention and amelioration in obvious ways, one of which is a well-regulated system of physical training.

I would strongly urge all those who are interested in the welfare of the country, if they have not already done so, to read some portions at any rate of the evidence recorded in the 638 pages of the second volume of the Scotch Report—this Report is a perfect mine of information. It is admirably and copiously indexed, so that no time need be wasted in putting one's finger on the special points on which information is sought.

My own study of these volumes has convinced me that the population under inquiry must not be taken as a whole; it must be resolved into its integral parts, and each of these parts must be separately considered.

We have the upper and well-to-do classes, the middle class, the class of well-to-do artisans, whose children enjoy perhaps greater advantages in the way of education than any other, and the poorer classes, including the sections of population which furnish our Industrial and Reformatory Schools with their inmates. Any attempt to strike a general average as to the advancement or otherwise of the nation as a whole from the information which we at present possess in regard to individual classes, and to present that average as a figure of merit for the British people, must be strongly deprecated. One point strikes a reader of the evidence particularly—namely, that nearly all those who dealt with the question of deterioration authoritatively fell back on the Reports of the Anthropometrical Committee of the British Association, made in 1882–3. Many of these gentlemen produced special statistics of their own compilation, yet all admitted that we have no definite statistical facts, and that a national physical census is absolutely necessary—at any rate, as regards Scotland.

There was, however, a remarkable consensus of opinion that amongst the well-to-do classes—male and female, and especially in regard to the latter sex—there has been, as the result of wiser feeding, improved ventilation, and good physical education, a well-marked physical advance. The average public schoolboy, taking those of Marlborough and Rugby as a sample, is at thirteen 2½ inches taller and between five and six pounds heavier than his predecessor of thirty years ago; the stature of the whole race is stated on the authority of the British Association to have increased by ¾ of an inch during one generation. But then, what class has contributed the elevating increment, and how far down in the social scale does this improvement extend?—this is the question which remains unanswered. Taking up the other end of the social scale, we are, as regards Scotland, met with a generally expressed opinion that owing to the change that has admittedly been made in the food and diet of the people, especially in the Highlands, from porridge and milk to tea and slops, white bread and tinned meats, a general degeneration either has or is taking place amongst those whom we have hitherto regarded as perhaps the most stalwart of the inhabitants of the British Isles.[1] The change of diet is universally admitted; its effects, however, are in certain quarters questioned. Those in a position to observe state that diseases of the digestive organs are very prevalent, that the children have an anæmic, bloodless, ill-fed, and weakly appearance.

[1] On the same evening that this address was delivered at the Royal United Service Institution (July 13), Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman asked in the House of Commons 'what had given Scottish people such an advantage over their Southron neighbours.' He had evidently forgotten his speech at Broughty Ferry, for he continued: 'Some people said it was education—not at all. It was the main staple of their food. They had been brought up on oatmeal, and there was nothing more conducive to the creation and maintenance of a stalwart and intelligent race than the use of oatmeal.' Lord Mansfield's report will afford Sir Henry some unpleasant reading and painful disillusionment.—O. T. D.

Mr. J. L. Robertson, one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools for the North of Scotland, states that in the Western Highlands he does not see much deterioration as yet. Dr. Bruce, one of the Highland Districts Medical Officers, who especially comments on the amount of anæmia evident amongst Highland children, and instances Lewis as a spot where the children are very miserable physically, and where the infant mortality is very great, nevertheless states that when these children grow up to be men you could not find stronger, healthier, more buirdly-like fellows, and declares that he does not think there is any appreciable deterioration of the general standard of the adult population. The assertion of the depreciation physically of the Highland population rests then on conjecture and not on measurement. It will be noted that the word whiskey rarely occurs in this Scotch inquiry, and yet we cannot believe that the people have given up drinking it; is it possible that in the balance of favour between whiskey and tea some compensating element may have been found which is benefiting the adult population? Leaving off, therefore, with the conviction that we do not quite know all the facts of the case, though we are certain that, whiskey or no whiskey, there has been a complete change in the diet of the Scotch people, I would ask you in this connection to note the undoubted fact that in England, amongst the well-to-do classes, which have admittedly improved physically, porridge has been regularly adopted as an article of diet, not only for children, but for adults. Now in South Africa, where are found the splendid Bantu races, such as the Zulus, and where the white child, whether of British or Dutch parentage, almost invariably develops a fine physique, the universal food for children is porridge, made as a rule from Indian corn; and as the Lord President of the Council states that the Royal Commission is to inquire into the best means of improving the national health and strength, I most sincerely trust that it will be called upon to investigate the influence of food generally, and of certain kinds of food in particular, on

the weight and stature and health of the people. The vast importance of this point has been clearly established in Scotland, and a great deal may be learned in regard to it from observations made on animals and insects. Lord Avebury, from whom I inquired on this point, kindly wrote me: 'It is, I believe, the case that by regulating the food ants and bees materially modify the form, size, and instincts of the perfect insect. I quite agree with you as to the great value of porridge as food.' It has been repeatedly remarked by expert witnesses that it is often not the actual want of food but the wrong character of foods used that has wrought such havoc amongst the children. In regard to England—and it must be noted that Ireland, which is believed to be in a much worse condition than either England or Scotland, though it has but few large towns, is not included in any inquiry at present proceeding—in regard to England itself we have none of that systematic statistical information which is available abroad, where conscription brings every young man before the medical officer to be measured and registered. It is but little consolation to ourselves to know that such registration shows that in certain urban districts in Germany, and in portions of France, sections of the population are becoming as unfit for military and industrial occupation as are certain sections in our own land; the figures that we have are, however, sufficiently disconcerting.

By the kindness of the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Earl of Meath was able to produce in the House of Lords, on Monday last, statistics in regard to boys for the Navy which are of the greatest interest, and a consideration of what has been ascertained will, I think, convince every impartial citizen that, seeing Governments do things by inquiry, a complete case for a physical inquest of the nation has been made out; but that citizen will, I think, also conclude that for himself the necessity for prompt and comprehensive action without waiting for Government initiative has been adequately brought home to us. It must not be thought by

anyone that, because our only available figures are derived from military and naval sources, this question in the first instance concerns our armies and fleets. If a man is not good enough to be a soldier, he is in fact, as a general principle, with of course well-defined exceptions, *à fortiori* unfitted for industrial competition. It is generally conceded that, whereas science and preventive medicine have diminished the rate of mortality amongst adults and increased the common duration of life by, I think, four years for men and six for women during the last fifty years—the case of infants being excepted, the mortality amongst them extending from one in two at Liverpool to an average of rather less than one in five for the whole country—yet during this period of fifty years there has amongst certain classes been a progressive diminution in height, weight, health, and energy, and this depreciation has probably proceeded on a ratio proportionate to the absorption and depreciation of the rural population by the urban districts. Using round numbers, one hundred years ago three-fourths of the population were to be found in the country and only one-fourth in the towns, which were of course then smaller and airier. Now in England rather less than one-quarter of the people live in the country, and rather more than three-quarters are resident in the towns. These figures are good for Scotland, with the omission of the qualifying words 'rather more' and 'rather less'; and this quarter of the population represents undoubtedly the less energetic portion of the rural classes. Now when about one-half of the people lived on the land—for in 1851 the town and country populations were almost exactly even in numbers—in 1845 the standard height for admission into the army was 5 feet 6 inches; in 1900 the standard was lowered to 5 feet, and in 1901 only four men in every ten attained to the minimum standard of fifty years before. Further, there has been a corresponding diminution in chest girth and weight. It is true that for the whole country in 1901 the ratio of men applying for military service rejected by the doctor was about

30 per cent., but this 30 per cent. does not include those who were not brought forward by the recruiting sergeant. These figures, however, do not reveal the appalling condition of the manufacturing towns. Take Manchester, for which we have definite figures. The average numbers applying to enlist in 1899, 1900, and 1901 were in round numbers about 12,000 per annum.

In 1899 28 per cent. were accepted, but of these only 9 per cent. were fit for the regular army; in 1900 33 per cent. were accepted; in 1901 26 per cent. were taken, but for these two last years I have not the figures as to how many of those accepted were taken for the regular army and how many for the Militia. Again, the publicly stated reports in regard to Volunteering put the numbers physically rejected in Birmingham at 45 per cent. It is not surprising that under these circumstances the Inspector-General of Recruiting reports in 1902 that the one object which causes anxiety as regards recruiting is the gradual deterioration of the physique of the working classes, from which the bulk of the recruits must always be drawn.

There is, however, worse still to be told. Out of the 70 per cent. who are passed by the doctors from amongst those who are brought forward by the recruiting sergeants, General Sir Frederick Maurice asserts publicly, and he has not been contradicted, that only two out of every five boys or lads or men who are enlisted are found as effective soldiers in the ranks after two years, and those who thus disappear are, he declares, miserable anæmic specimens of humanity, fit to do no proper man's work in any position in life. How do these figures work out? Of the 70 per cent. who pass the doctor, 42 per cent. are thrown out in the first two years; so that out of one hundred men appearing before the doctor, at the end of two years twenty-eight per cent. will be serving and seventy-two will have been rejected.[1] I will

[1] In consequence of a conversation which I have had with Sir F. Maurice since this address was delivered, I hasten to take the opportunity

not harrow your feelings by any calculation as to what are the numbers of men of this class of the population who, if the preliminary rejections made by the sergeants were counted in, would be found wanting in every hundred. Lord Selborne's figures, kindly given to the Earl of Meath, as regards the Navy are not more encouraging. The First Lord, however, openly expresses the reservation which undoubtedly lies behind the Inspector-General of Recruiting's report as follows: This list, he remarks, by no means covers the whole number of men and boys who apply for entry into the Royal Navy and Marines, as a very large percentage of the applicants are turned away by the recruiting sergeants for some physical deficiency, such as defective teeth, without being brought before the doctor at all. One Admiralty provincial recruiting officer's statement puts this number unhesitatingly at 50 per cent. Lord Selborne states that in 1902, at the Royal Marine Recruiting Offices for the Royal Navy and Marines, 6,169 lads offered themselves, of which number 1,686, or 27 per cent. in round numbers, were rejected. If the provincial recruiting officer's statement holds good, and there is very little doubt that it is based on solid facts, then only about 20 per cent. of the boy population is fit for service in the Navy. This, of course, applies to the working classes.

Unfortunately these figures accord with those actually made out by Mr. J. G. Legge, His Majesty's Inspector of

afforded by proof revision to modify the figures as regards the army given in this paragraph. Sir F. Maurice points out that he has been misquoted, and that his explicit statement is to be found in the January 1903 number of the 'Contemporary Review.' It is as follows: 'According to the best estimate I have been able to arrive at, it has been for many years true that out of every five men who *wish to enlist and primarily* offer themselves for enlistment you will find that by the end of two years' service there are only two men remaining in the army as effective soldiers.' Sir F. Maurice *has included in* his estimate the *rejections* by the sergeants, so that, according to our present information *for the whole country*, of every hundred men who present themselves to the recruiting sergeant 40 per cent., and not 28 per cent., will be found in the ranks at the end of two years.

Industrial and Reformatory Schools. In these schools the boys at the age of thirteen average four inches less in height and a stone less in weight than the ordinary public school-boy of that age. Mr. Legge states that the dimensions of over 1,000 boys of between fourteen and fifteen years of age were scrutinised with a view to ascertaining how many might reasonably be expected to reach the naval standard at fifteen years and three months; the percentage came to about fifteen. These are facts which cannot be gainsaid; what is the explanation of them? Some day a Royal Commission will tell us its views. I think Lord Selborne has himself furnished sufficient data to warrant the holding of a *Physical Inquest of the Nation*.

Without waiting, then, for the report of the Commission, we are, I think, able to come to the conclusion that the physical condition of our people requires urgent attention; the degeneration which has been ascertained is clearly the result of environment, of *wrong* food more than of want of food, of bad air, want of light and physical exercise. The degeneration which we have to deal with to-day has been described by one of the ablest of the Scotch witnesses, Dr. Leslie Mackenzie, Medical Inspector to the Local Government Board in Scotland, as generational degeneration, as distinct from transmissible degeneration. Dr. Mackenzie means degeneration of a particular generation acted on by special outside influences, and he maintains that in this kind of degeneration produced by environment the scope for betterment by improved nurture is almost unlimited; consequently the benefit from physical training is almost unlimited. The only escape from the deterioration which is the result of the gathering of the population in towns and cities is to as far as possible restore the conditions of country life to the urban population. Apart from reforms in the matter of light, air, and food which must be concurrently adopted, the healthy exercise which outdoor manual labour afforded to great masses of the people must be restored in

the shape of continuation classes for gymnastics and drill in suitable well-ventilated buildings, and above all by an enlightened and comprehensive system of physical training in our schools.

In times of national danger other nations have seen salvation in physical training, and have thus renewed their vigour and spirit. When Napoleon had overrun Europe Ling started to endeavour to make each Swede equal physically to two or three Frenchmen, and this was the starting-point of the celebrated Swedish system of drill, which was essentially military in its origin. In 1811 Jahn and his followers, supported by the Prussian minister Stein, established a system of physical education throughout Prussia, the effects of which were made apparent in 1815.

But the greatest of the social problems in connection with physical training lies in the fact that large numbers of the children who attend our schools are suffering from unrecognised disease, and are not supplied with food sufficient to allow of either physical or intellectual development. It is quite clear that this difficulty cannot be met by State interference, and this point is discussed at great length in many parts of the Scotch Report. I take it that the solution of this difficulty is a matter that has probably already engaged in the past, and must engage in a much larger degree in the future, the attention of the Council which I have the honour to address to-day.

It may seem to be a fatuity to discuss in regard to a considerable section of the population which is primarily unfit to receive any training of any kind, so active a remedial agent as physical training, but there was an extraordinary consensus of opinion amongst the witnesses in Scotland that there could be no sound intellectual and indeed moral education independently of it; there was scarcely a dissentient note in this common accord.

Not only must physical training be universally enforced, but a considerable portion of the lesson time must be allo-

cated to it henceforth. There must be no education without it; if the children are not sufficiently nourished to undergo it, then charity must step in and feed them or arrange for their being fed, since the menace of socialism with its far-reaching complications which a further extension of State interference between child and parent might involve has to be considered.

Physical education will have a much wider effect than the training of the scholars; it brings in its wake or rather impels in front of it a general consideration of the fitness of the child for any education at all, which must involve remedial measures, and in these remedial measures the C.O.S. cannot fail to play a leading part. We are undergoing a silent but portentous social revolution. Our reforms are seldom made as the results of principle; the corn laws were repealed not because high policy dictated such a step, but because there was a famine in Ireland and a failure of crops elsewhere. Free education was given not on its merits, but because, having compelled the parents to send the children to school, the magistrates objected to fine them and punish them if they were unable to pay the fees. In the matter of teaching a greater enlightenment has shown us the partial one-sided and defective character of our education, and has displayed a chasm of hunger and weakness which must not be allowed to bar the revival of the nation. But are we to fling into this chasm a fresh instalment of our individualistic beliefs? Are we getting nearer to the recognition of the State child, with its logical complement of State-selected parents? These are problems in connection with physical training which require prompt and definite solution, and which, I take it, are essentially fit for the consideration of your honourable Council.

I have thus at some length considered the first three of the five headings under which I proposed to deal with my subject. The fourth point—namely, what is being done at present in elementary schools, the merits and defects of the

same—you will not care to have treated in a technical way; for in fact the whole movement is more or less in a state of solution. Acting up to their lights, at the urgent insistence of the Lads' Drill Association, the Board of Education, on recognising that the terms chaotic confusion and incompetency best described the physical training arrangements in large numbers of schools, issued a Model Course of Physical Training, which it hoped would be gradually universally adopted and made the basis of Physical Education. It was based on the principles that had proved so successful in the Aldershot gymnasium. The history of this Model Course is somewhat long and complicated; it is fully given in the Report of the Lads' Drill Association for 1902. The Report of the Scotch Commission has, however, lifted the whole question on to a much higher and wider level; the authorities have recognised that a universal British system, easily adapted to local exigencies and the ages and sex of the school children, and put together in the open, must be devised. Accordingly the Model Course is in the crucible, and the whole physical training of the country in so far as the Board of Education is concerned, though happily not as regards local authorities, is in a state of suspension. A very able joint committee, English and Scotch, has been appointed, of which Mr. Struthers, the Under-Secretary of the Board of Education in Scotland, is Chairman. It includes such well-known authorities as Dr. Tuke of Dunfermline and Dr. Ker of the London School Board, also Colonel Fox, and others representative of the various school interests. It is hoped that during the next month or so this Committee will be able to issue a handbook of physical training and drill for experimental use in selected schools, and that within a reasonable period teachers will have for their guidance a system of physical training which can be successfully established in all our schools. The bugbear of militarism which Mr. Macnamara raised in the House of Commons and in the columns of the *Daily News*, but which he himself effectually dissipated in

the columns of the *Manchester Guardian*, need not be seriously considered. The urgent need of the time is a supply of duly qualified teachers. The remedying of this defect has now been placed by the Education Act in the hands of the local authorities. In May last Lord Meath addressed the chairmen of them all, urging the importance of this duty. As might naturally be expected, physical training has been popular with the children, with their parents, and with managing bodies—all these have recognised its advantages. There has, however, been considerable direct and indirect opposition by teachers. Now the remodelling of our system of training constitutes a revolution, and it is absolutely essential that those who have done their duty well under the old system should not be ridden over roughshod ; their position deserves every consideration. The great mass of teachers have loyally and cheerfully—aye, readily—done their best to adapt themselves at great personal effort and expense to the new system; but we must not seek to effect these changes, salutary as they may be, with too great haste. Any rash or inconsiderate attempt to create, as it were, the new educational world by ukase would arouse opposition which must seriously retard its development.

Local bodies will probably prove far more capable of dealing with this matter than the Board of Education has been ; the alarms which have been raised in the bosoms of most deserving teachers will be allayed, and such arrangements be effected as shall secure the protection of teachers who from age, want of voice or health, are unable to qualify for this work, but who are none the less competent instructors in intellectual matters.

The fifth point in my syllabus is the development of youths above thirteen, and the advantages which result from carrying this out on the lines in use in the army.

We have advocated for children in our elementary schools a system of physical training which shall embrace both sexes, and shall turn the children out alert, quick, obedient, and

with a normal muscular system, neither athletes nor soldiers —'mens sana in corpore sano' to be our object.

The consideration of the lines on which this condition can be maintained for girls I have not undertaken to deal with in this paper. The problem of how to deal with the boys is a sufficiently difficult one; glad to escape from school restraint, many run wild and become what in England we call hooligans. The Chief Constable of Edinburgh, Mr. Ross —who complains very bitterly of the steady increase of juvenile crime in the modern Athens—declines to allow the larrikins of his city to be called hooligans. A hooligan, he maintains, is a garrotter and a footpad. We must in the south continue to associate this word with a class of boys bursting with animal energy, with no employment, whose playground is the streets, and whose moral guide is the poisonous literature which glorifies the highwayman and records with ghastly details all the crimes and horrors of the police courts and assizes. Then there is the large mass of well-conducted, industrious youth who are without means of recreation, and whose education has rarely fitted them for the keener competition with the foreign workman which is nowadays demanded of them. Military drill attracts and occupies young people, it associates them in a manner which enables them to feel the invigorating influence of comradeship, of *esprit de corps*, it enables them to take the first step in fitting themselves if the necessity should arise to take part in the defence of their country by land or sea; in short, it endues them with the virtues which are essential to a good citizen. Then why not establish as part of a secondary system of continuation education the teaching of military drill, the classes for such teaching being incorporated in cadet companies and battalions? It is well known that the Boys' Brigades, the Church Lads' Brigades, and other bodies of the kind which are, without doubt, doing admirable work, are using military drill, and ten days in camp in the country, I will not say as a bait, but as an attraction which serves to group young lads

around particular religious centres, in much the same way that the Nonconformist Churches have been compelled to adopt the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon instead of the assembly for dogmatic teaching. The machinery of the Salvation Army is a marvellous instance of how military symbolism may be used for religious purposes with powerful effect; but a system founded on sectarianism cannot be recognised by the State. This was fully perceived in Scotland, and the continuation class scheme broke down in connection with the Boys' Brigade. I feel that the public mind is still scarcely prepared for the further steps that must yet be taken to continue the education of the boy until he is 18 years old. I would beg all who recognise that more has yet to be done to study the Scotch report in this matter. I think that we shall come to see that this further education must include, besides technical instruction, advanced physical training, gymnastics, swimming, military drill in cadet bodies, shooting in miniature ranges, marching, and, as far as possible, organised games, such as football, cricket, hockey, and running. I am aware that the self-sacrificing pioneers of these principles are actively at work, men who devote their time, their talents, and their means to the establishment of boys' clubs and other institutions of like kind. The Cadet movement is everywhere gaining ground, and has undoubtedly received an impetus from the action of that distinguished soldier and good citizen, Sir Edward Ward, who is raising a Cadet Battalion from the boys employed in the Civil Service offices. In this particular line of progress I cannot, at this late time, do more than adumbrate—and I am not clear that its advancement lies immediately within the scope of the Charity Organisation Society. I trust, however, that the Council will pardon me for having endeavoured to establish in its presence the thesis that in the elementary school it has a great, a national, and a patriotic as well as charitable work to perform well worthy of its most strenuous efforts. The Secretary to the Board of Education gave

currency recently in the House of Commons to the statement that there are 60,000 children in London who, from physical inferiority, are unable to obtain any benefit from either physical or intellectual training. Here is indicated a great task. I will conclude my paper by quoting in this connection some eloquent words uttered, not by a dead orator, but by a living statesman. They were spoken a few days ago by Sir W. Anson in the House of Commons. He exclaimed: 'Statutes will never create a moral up-rising; what is wanted is voluntary effort—the work of men and women for men and women—in these poor places, probably as managers of schools, getting to know the children and trying to impress on parents the duty they owed to their children. There are well-to-do people who might occupy themselves in this matter. It would not be detective work. The work I am suggesting that these people should do is not on the face of it attractive work—the process of regeneration is bound to be slow and full of disappointment, and to be marred by the frequent conviction of total failure; and yet I promise to anyone who will undertake work of this sort and carry it through that some morning or other they may wake up and find that though they have deliberately sacrificed their pleasure, they have found happiness unawares.' To this invocation I say Amen.

O. T. D.

July 1903.

V

A POLICY OF HUSTLING; OR, THE LOCK AND KEY

A PLEA FOR A SEARCH INTO THE POWERS OF THE EXISTING LAWS

The conclusions arrived at by Sir K. E. Digby, K.C.B., Under Secretary for the Home Department, in his 'Memorandum upon the Report by the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration,' Vol. I., 1903, page 51, in regard to the question of overcrowding, are not only so true in regard to the subject under review, but are equally suitable to a variety of subjects of paramount importance to every local authority in the country. Sir K. E. Digby says:—'The answer so often given in the course of this inquiry to the suggestion of enforcing the law, that it is impossible to turn the lodgers into the streets, would equally apply to the enforcement of the law elsewhere, to the great displacements caused by public and private constructions, and to the operation of similar legislation which has abated the evils of the terrible overcrowding in existence when the Legislature first took the matter in hand. . . .

'It appears to me, therefore, that the true conclusions to be drawn from the evidence are:—

'(1) That in the East End of London the powers given by the Legislature have never yet been fully exercised.

'(2) That if they were exercised to an extent which is reasonably possible there is no reason why, notwithstanding

the influx, overcrowding should not be brought under effective control.

'(3) That by a thorough and uniform administration of the existing law, the object aimed at in the recommendation of preventing newly-arrived aliens adding to the overcrowding conditions of a district already full would be attained more effectively than by the method suggested of declaring certain areas to be prohibited. There would be the additional advantage that no novel or expensive machinery would be required beyond, what appears necessary, some addition to the number of inspectors.'

These conclusions are just the sum and substance of what prevails in the public administration all over the country, and what is now wanted has been defined in evidence before the recent Municipal Housing Commission in Glasgow as the Policy of Hustlin ; or, the Lock and Key.

Acts of Parliament are passed sometimes owing to stress, or a local municipal authority takes up a sort of hobby which is sandwiched into a private omnibus Bill, and becomes law, only to be forgotten the moment that zealous public man at whose instance the law was created either retires or is beaten at the Polls. Then again we have amendments upon recent statutes, following some defeats in the Law Courts, which are no sooner passed than they are practically laid on the shelf, only to be referred to as the production of some active Committee. The provision for the relief of the poor in England and Scotland goes on apace, the quality of hospital treatment and nursing increases, and now is far superior to what was ever contemplated by the framers of the original Acts. A great deal of wise reading into the Acts has been made by the Government Departments of the country, but the moment it is suggested that a suitable case should be sent to a parish hospital, the members of local bodies are up in arms at the idea of compelling any one to go, and would rather give out-door relief in the form of a small sum just to

pay the rent; they will not read into Acts or Rules when it becomes an individual or personal question.

The same result comes out in dealing with cases of overcrowding. The officers may prosecute, but the Magistrate—not a Stipendiary—does not convict; such magistrates have theories of their own upon everything, including the Housing problem and the duty of the local authority to provide houses for certain classes, but sometimes it is not safe to come down upon a so-called ratepayer who contravenes these and other bygone Police Acts, or woe betide his Worship at the next election. Excuses, too, are numerous, and there is no machinery to inquire into the statements made at the bar of the Court, which are too often taken as truth—statements made by the shifting class that can never be criticised. The delinquent, therefore, is merely admonished and moves away to another district, where the same process goes on. Is it ever realised that there is constantly a large floating population of vagrants and loafers who frequent the cities and towns and create a housing problem; who go to lodge with the lowest class of occupiers, and beg and steal when they can? If this class were hustled along and compelled to retire to the Poorhouse, failing which—to the prison, it would be vastly cheaper and better than allowing them to be outside. It is only by a strict, consistent and even-handed justice that this can be done: justice to the vagrant and the loafer—as you would give education to a child—by letting him understand he is to work; that if he is ill he will be housed and treated till better, that he will be saved from disease and early death; in this way also doing justly by the law-abiding ratepayer who is bound to be protected from the inroads of this class, from begging and stealing, and from all manner of disease and vermin. What causes the great bulk of our infectious diseases, small-pox, &c., but the manner of living of these men and women? Our towns and cities will not be free as they should be—comparatively—till the strong arm of the law is put in operation. Why in the name of common sense

should the great body of sorely-burdened ratepayers continue to be bled by the few hundreds all because of the fetish of the 'Liberty of the subject'?

I contend that the laws laid down in the Statute Book are wide enough to clear the streets of the people referred to. What is wanted is sufficient men, and strong-headed administrators, to bring up for trial, where moral suasion will not avail, all the habituals known to the authorities, and let them feel and know that there is to be a period of strict application of the laws.

For philanthropic purpose and full appreciation for the wants of the poor of the cities there is no country like Germany. That country is time and again referred to as the pioneer in all that is good; but running alongside we have a thoroughgoing strict application of the laws for cleanliness and for charity. There is no mealy-mouthed (a Scotch expression) sentimentality about hose washing out a dirty house or tenement, and sending the inmates thereof to shelters in the country.

To come from the general to the particular, let us look at some of the evidence given at the recent inquiry in Glasgow upon the housing of the poor, alluded to at the outset of this paper. As one of the expert witnesses before the Commission, I there stated that the existing legislation was quite sufficient if properly and consistently applied, that it was quite unnecessary to proceed to eviction if the present laws against landlord and tenant were enforced. The late plague in Glasgow was instanced, where the sanitary authorities adopted drastic measures in the infected area, and it was suggested that similar areas of the everyday plague should be undertaken in the same way. Here again there were veiled doubts of the sufficiency of the existing laws for such an action; all the questions put were chiefly of a negative character—where were the statutes, sections, &c., for such authority? They were there already, but no one seemed to be able to put his finger on them. The very people who

ought to have had them at their finger ends had to get them pointed out, and all the while the fear was that by this drastic proceeding people would be dishoused; and why not, I ask, when they were physically and morally unfit to keep a house? If they had been dishoused they would have found shelter in the places prescribed for them by law. I was asked, 'Your solution is that you would lock all these people up?' I said I would. Then I was asked if I knew what it would cost; and my reply was, that if 500 of them were confined for three months it would cost about £800. The idea of such a thing was too much for some of the Commissioners, and I was asked what would be done with the lot after the three months, and I answered, 'Put them in again, if they will not work.' If they will not work neither should they eat.

As a sound investment against dirt, destitution, and death, I have time and again suggested that every local authority should employ an expert to wade through the miles of statutes, public and private, and now fallen into desuetude by reason of changes in the representation of elected authorities and the administrative staffs, and he would find abundant material to work upon which has lain fallow for years.

It not infrequently happens that an adverse decision has been given in a prosecution on a particular point, and there it is allowed to lie, the same points, though arising every day, are never tried again or made the grounds of a strong appeal.

So far as local administration is concerned there need be no legislation for years, or at all events till the resources of the existing statutes have been strained to the very breaking point.

J. R. M.

VI

AGRICULTURE AND THE UNEMPLOYED QUESTION

AN ADDRESS

I PROPOSE to answer to the best of my ability some questions that have been given to me by your Society on certain topics touched upon in my book, 'Rural England,' or rather to dwell upon them for a while.

The first clause on the paper which has been submitted to me runs thus: 'To show the general bearing of the remedies suggested in your book on the conditions of large towns, with special reference to the physical and economic competence of the people.' Now, what are the remedies which I have ventured to suggest in my book? They are briefly these: That a greater care should be shown by those in authority towards the land of England—that a more active agricultural policy, as I might call it, should be pursued by English Governments. Then, in order to follow up this suggestion, I put forward various, I can scarcely call them remedies, I will call them palliatives that should be adopted which, if followed out, would in my opinion go far towards producing a healthier and a better state of affairs. These palliatives I may say in the main tend towards one thing, the establishment of a greater number of persons upon the land of England as workers or owners of that land.

Briefly, one of them is that credit banks should be established under the authority and control of Government. Now these credit banks are, as you may have heard, very

largely in force upon the Continent. The system is called the 'Raffeisen,' and it practically amounts to this, that all the members who can borrow from such a bank agree mutually to guarantee the credit of any other member; that is to say, if six of them combine to form a bank, and if one of these fails, the remaining five have to pay. The result of that, of course, is pretty clear—they are very careful as to whom they admit into its membership. At first this sounds rather a new idea, but anyone who has lived on the Continent must have often seen it at work. I am not certain whether it was in Austria alone, or in Austria combined with one or two neighbouring countries where the system has been established, that in 1901 a very large sum, I believe eleven millions, was turned over by means of these credit banks, and not a half-penny was lost. There are a few of them in existence in England. I myself inspected one at Scawby, in Lincolnshire. I have no time to go into the details of what I saw there, but I can assure you this single small bank, with its tiny capital of a few hundreds, had done an astonishing amount of good in that neighbourhood. I was convinced by what was told me and by its written records that this credit society had succeeded in establishing quite a number of small people upon the land. The establishment and multiplication of such banks, then, is one of the remedies or palliatives that I have suggested.

I think, further, with reference to the question of rural housing, that Government should advance the money for building where it is necessary. Mind you, I do not ask for anything to be given, only that individuals or public bodies who so desire should be allowed to borrow at reasonable rates of interest that are inclusive of a Sinking Fund, to enable them to put up cottages and farm buildings on small holdings. I think, also, that the limits of the Parcels Post should be much enlarged, say to 100 lbs., so as to enable the small man to get his produce to the markets night by night. The state of affairs in this country is really very strange when you

consider that we have the finest markets in the whole world, and that these markets are eager and craving for produce of every sort, and yet where does our produce come from? Three-fourths of it from abroad, from foreign countries, where Governments are not above attending to these matters and adopting these minor remedies. Here we have a land that was never more fertile—here we have men who certainly would be willing to work—here we have a hungry market, and yet most of our foodstuffs come from abroad. Such, stated very briefly, are some of the remedies which I have suggested, but upon which I cannot now stop to dwell, as I have to go on to comment upon the various points that have been raised in your paper of questions.

Now I pass to 'the general bearing of the remedies suggested by you (*i.e.* by myself) on the condition of large towns with special reference to the physical economic competence of the people.' You ladies and gentlemen who belong to this admirable Society, if I may say so, are better acquainted with the conditions of the poor in large towns than I am. I only know of such matters as a general observer. As a general observer, of course, I see certain things which I cannot but see; for instance, that the youths and girls and the men and women whom you meet now in the lower parts of the cities are very different beings to the men and women you meet in the country side. I gather also from various reports of medical men and persons well acquainted with these matters that the inhabitants of these great cities, such as London or Manchester or Bristol, are deteriorating very much physically, mentally, and morally. I have been told even, though I do not know whether the fact is capable of being proved, that after three generations they are practically worthless unless reinforced by some new blood, and indeed die out. At any rate, I think we may take it that there is no person in this theatre who will disagree with me when I say, as regards the matter of physical competence, that their physical competence is not in any way to be put upon a par with the physical

competence of those who dwell in the fields and in the villages of England.

To come to the economic side of the question. I suppose when this question was put to me about the economic competence of the town-dwelling folk, the meaning was what such people could earn. Generally speaking, their value to the State may be summed up thus: The young and strong who come to the town may do better than those who remain in the country, for they earn a better wage while they are young and strong, but how the results work out for those of the ages of, say, between fifty and seventy is another matter. My own opinion is, then, taking them over the average, that the economic competence of the inhabitants of cities is not in any way equal to the economic competence of the ordinary dweller in the country.

Yesterday I was reading a Sunday paper and I happened to look down the advertisements and I saw one which I cut out, because it seemed to me to have what I might almost call a painful and an ominous meaning. It runs thus: 'Grey hair; no need to be unemployed though looking old. One shilling per bottle,' and so on. Well, of course, it seems a slight thing, but there is a deal of significance in that puff of a patent hair-dye. Why did the advertiser put that notice in the paper? It was because he knew there is a demand for his stuff and for the reason stated, that grey-haired people in the towns find it more and more difficult to get employment. Now, compare that with the country.

Taking the country through, I should say the majority of labourers working the land are grey-haired men. I have seen many of them in the most decrepit condition, but still able to find work. In short, there is in London and the other great cities an eager market for the very pick of young men and women, but for the person who is growing old and can no longer perhaps put in quite a full day—for the person who must trudge from employer to employer to tout for work when he grows old there is no market—there is no demand in the

town for the weakly, the failing, and the aged. Also, this movement of the people to the towns has a still larger and more far-reaching issue. It should, I think, be considered in relation to the national welfare. Of course, that issue raises the whole question of the present-day rush to the cities.

Why do people crowd into the cities? Well, I have had a good deal of experience; I have been to many places in England, and I have questioned hundreds of well-informed persons upon the point, and these are my conclusions. One reason that they crowd into the cities—I will keep the largest reason to the last—is because of our system of 'education.' Education, of course, is a very good thing; we all admit that, but education as administered in the country districts is not always that which might be desired. To begin with, the teachers are town people, nine out of ten of whom know very little of the country and its needs; therefore, they give to the country children a town education. Secondly, under our system children are kept in school until a period when it is very difficult to accustom them subsequently to work upon the land. Many and many an expert, many and many an old farmer who has had fifty years of experience, have told me that unless you can get a lad accustomed to horses and cattle and rural pursuits generally by the time he is about ten or eleven, he will never be accustomed to them; after that, he is afraid of the animals, and he loathes labour on the land.

That is one reason of the exodus. Another is that nowadays papers go everywhere, people read about all sorts of exciting things, and afterwards they find the country uncommonly dull. Well, it is no doubt dull at times, and, that being so, they all want to go to the town, where there are music-halls and entertainments of every kind, and places to meet in. Also they find advantages there which they lack in villages; for instance, there are such things as water-taps in London which are generally lacking in the villages, and it is possible for a child to keep dry-shod in going to school by walking on the pavement instead of being obliged to trudge a

mile or two along a sloppy village road in every kind of weather. That is a second reason, and there are others which I could mention, but I will come at once to the last and to my mind the greatest.

The real fundamental cause why the people of this island are flocking towards the cities in such numbers is that the rural population has no prospect of rising on the land. Such, at least, is my strong belief. Now consider the life of an agricultural labourer. He earns in all, let us say, 16*s.* a week in my part of the world, a little more in the South and in Yorkshire; there it might come to £1 including his haysel and his harvest. Out of that he pays, let us say, 1*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* for a cottage. He rears a family. He contributes to his sick club, and in order to do this he must labour continually; there are no little holidays off for him, he has to work week in and week out, for if he does not work he will not be paid, and if he is not paid he will starve. He begins to labour, let us say, at fifteen or sixteen, and goes on labouring, let us say, to seventy or seventy-five. At that age, or before it, he ultimately breaks up, and has to be supported or sinks into the workhouse and dies. No one can say that is altogether an attractive prospect. I do not think any of us would like to take on the contract. So what does the agricultural labourer say—the young fellow who has just grown up?—the old man cannot say anything of course, his day is done. He says: 'My cousin has gone up to town; he has got a good berth as a turncock, or a policeman, or a carman, or such like, and he is paid so many shillings a week. He is so many shillings a week better off than I am. He has found a young woman and married her, and they seem happy enough, and they may rise to earn £100 a year.' Naturally he wants to join him and do likewise. But five out of six when they get to London find that there is no £100 a year waiting for them. When they are broken down and every new-comer has trodden them under foot with the selfishness which marks this age, and probably has marked all ages, they will be heard to wish that

they had confined themselves to their native village. But then it is too late.

If you have any doubt about the matter, if your special knowledge leaves you uninstructed, you cannot, I imagine, do better than read Mr. Rowntree's book upon the condition of York. Now I know York; it is a small city, comparatively, of about 65,000 people—quite a minor place, yet you will see it set out there, in that remarkable work of Mr. Rowntree's, who perhaps has confined himself to a small place, because to deal with a bigger one would be beyond the power of man, that most of those people there, labourers in the town, are living in a condition of penury. They have not a penny for any pleasure, for any amusement, or any alleviation of their lot. No paper, no glass of beer, no pipe of tobacco, nothing extra, he declares, can be paid for. Yet remember this: when I was there two years ago the condition of affairs in Yorkshire was such that many a farmer within twenty miles of York was glad enough, and frequently was unable, to procure labour at £1 a week and a good cottage.

Now what a remarkable state of affairs is that, looked at in the light of circumstances as they now are! I have been told that I am a pessimist. When a man writes an important book of social investigation, he feels gratified by the long reviews and articles in the Quarterlies and the rest, but all the same he finds that the writers of these notices will generally, and very naturally, have their own preconceived opinions. I do not blame them for it, but they are very apt to look at things strictly from their own point of view, which is sometimes narrow. They are acquainted with one locality or perhaps with two out of a hundred dealt with in the work, and they proceed to argue upon the lines and in the direction to which their individual characters and experiences attract them, and they all invariably say that the author of the work is a little wrong on this point, and greatly wrong on that point, because his views do not agree with theirs. I dare say I am very wrong on many points, for I can assure you there is no

more humble creature in this world than I am. I have learnt so much about these matters connected with the land and its population that it has taught me how much I have still to learn; but at the same time I cannot help remembering this: that whereas many of my critics are people acquainted perhaps with their own counties and few others, I have looked at these things in many lights and many districts of England.

Therefore, before they write me down a pessimist I should like a few of them to follow in my footsteps, to go round and collect the evidence and examine the witnesses, and consider the condition of things all round as I have done, then to write their own impressions. I should be very much astonished if in the result such impressions did not tally very closely with those which I have submitted to the world.

However, it so happens that yesterday I received from the Central Chamber of Agriculture a report of the Rural Depopulation Committee. I read it, I cannot say with pleasure, because it is a sad document, but certainly with interest, because this Rural Depopulation Committee does absolutely and very conclusively endorse the decisions at which I have arrived. I have been told that I misinterpret the figures, but what do the Committee say? They say that they find in the rural districts of a great number of counties the decrease is from 1 to 8 per cent. They add that in purely agricultural parishes it is from 12 to 28 per cent., and in some smaller villages one-third to one-half of the inhabitants. The causes which they give are exactly those which I have given in my work. One of them is the spread of education, that I have already alluded to, venturing to point out some remedies. I have suggested in my book that the acquirement of small holdings of various sizes by suitable persons should be facilitated, and they suggest the same. The Committee demonstrate, further, that agriculture has been systematically organised in other countries, and that such organisation would yield results as good in this country; and they urge lastly, what I have dwelt on also, that the State should take such

matters into its earnest consideration, and that within certain proper limits State aid should be granted with the object of increasing our rural population and making it prosperous. You will understand, I have read that report with no little interest, because sometimes I really began to think that I must be wrong, and certain of my critics must be right. This document, however, points to another conclusion.

Now I pass to the next question. You asked me 'to explain whether any system can be adopted by which persons resident in towns and, after examination, proved to be suitable for agricultural labour, could be drafted to places where there is a demand;' also, 'whether, in connection with the country press or in some other way, any system which would be equivalent to that of a labour bureau might with advantage be adopted?' My answer is that I think all these things might be done; labour bureaux might be established, and so on; and I would add local agents, with an intelligent knowledge of the different places, who would report where men were wanted, might be appointed.

But I want to qualify this answer. You must remember this is very largely a question of cost: labour bureaux and agents and so forth involve a great expenditure, perhaps greater than your Society would be able to meet; also you must remember this: that it is not the slightest use your spending your funds in sending useless and unfit persons into the country. Now a very instructive letter was read[1] to you

[1] The letter had been received by an East End Committee from a man who had been sent down to Somersetshire. He was a town-bred stevedore, out of work, with a wife and four young children. His health had been very poor in London, and it was thought that a country life might set him up. Both he and his wife were keen to go.

'Just a few lines to you to tell you that I can not stop down here as this place is killing us all we have got no fire place in yet and we have to get wood in and light a fire on the stone ground and we have the door open all the time and we are smoke out with that open and the weather is cold here to have a door open while you cook a bit of food and we have never been warm since we came down here . . . and their is a nother thing the house we are in the ceiling are low you can not get in

before I rose. That letter is quite typical, as I know very well, of the mind of a great number of indigent Cockneys who while they are in the town announce that they want to go to the country and work there; but when they get to the country, what then? A week or two ago I read a very amusing article in one of the London papers, written when there was this unemployed trouble in London and the people were walking about shaking boxes in your faces, saying, 'Give us work or give us bread!' That London newspaper—the *Daily Express*—selected a man who seemed to be suitable to their experiment, and sent him down with a representative into the country to see if he could find employment. I think it was to Wiltshire. This man found farmers who would be glad to hire him, but they lived some miles from the town—it was Salisbury, I think—and he asked for a cab to take him out to visit them! Afterwards he met a flock of sheep, which

and out of the bed without knocking your head even the children knock their head . . . he cannot get people to live in a place like we are in we are right in the woods and when we go to work we have got to climb the hills to get to the level ground and my heart is so bad I have to set down when I get to the top and my wife legs are very bad she is broken hearted with beening here all the children are bad in health I know myself is getting on very bad its know good to me if I stop here I know I shall be dead . . . even the villagers tell us what a dreadful place we are in they say it is a shame to bring people from their comfortable london homes to bury their lives in a place like this they say he should have come first before he brought my wife and family in such a place as this their is 9 months of winter here and when I told the villagers the farmer said he thought if we all come together I would get on better with my family round me they all laught they can see we was led in a trap and the other London folks are the same as my self they will not stop they are off and one more word that is about work I got to work harder than I did in london for 12 Shillings a week and my wife work twice as hard for five a sixpence a week and their is no rest at all and when we want water we got to get it out a stream up to your knees in mud and water and when you go to get food it takes two or three hours and it is very nice roads to travel and climb I have to go with my wife shoping in case she looses her way through the woods, a take a light my wife says that if there was a shop she would sell her home off and go strait into the workhouse in london rather than she stay here.

came running down the street as sheep will, whereon he skipped nimbly into a doorway, saying, 'Lor'! them be *very spirited animals*.' After that he was brought back to town.

Now, I would like to ask you, what can be the use of such a man in the country? Here I have in my hand a letter which has just been forwarded to me from the Secretary of your own Islington Committee, in which he says he thought I might like to have some particular instances of their experiments in this direction. He says that he sent a man down to Wiltshire as a labourer. This man was willing and anxious to go, and he had won some experience of farm work as a boy. He was turned off after a fortnight because he was not successful in his milking, and the farmer who employed him said that he would not keep him because 'he could not have his cows spoilt in order to allow him to learn.' Personally I am a farmer, and I sympathise with that other farmer, knowing as I do that cows are very likely to be damaged by unskilful milking. Another man was sent, apparently to a good situation as a gardener, where he got 15*s*. a week and a cottage and garden—by no means bad wages—but he came back to London because he said that the wages were not good enough, and because his children had to walk five miles to school, two and a half miles out and two and a half home, and he wanted to get back to town and, I suppose, call upon your Secretary.

I quote these cases simply for this reason, that I wish to point out it is absolutely futile to send unfit persons down to the country, thinking they are going to undertake the hard work of an agricultural labourer. Everybody talks of the farm hand as though he was a fool, but he is nothing of the sort. He is an uncommonly clever fellow, and if we all were set to work to do what he does in a day we should be very much of that opinion at the end of it. You cannot take any person off the streets and send him to do these tasks. In the first place, he hates them; and, in the second, he is unfit for them; and if he does get to the end of

his day at all, he has done nothing as an agricultural labourer would do it, who is a highly trained person in his own fashion. Therefore I point out to you that it is folly to take wastrels from the street and to send them down to the country to become labourers.

But how about the young? I think there is something to be done with them, provided you send them young enough; but it is no good to attempt it after they are sixteen.

The next question is whether any system can be adopted to make the young men competent for agricultural work; and whether any farm colonies or other similar schemes are of real utility in this direction; and whether teaching in regard to agriculture, such as that adopted, it is stated with success, both in Denmark and Italy, and I believe also in France, would be of service? Now, my answers to those questions are these. Certainly such a system for making lads competent for agricultural work could be adopted; but that, again, would involve the establishment of rural training-schools, which are expensive things and would require to be very carefully managed by people who understand the whole matter thoroughly. Again, this is a question of funds; and not only of funds, but of their steady and systematic application. Mere casual and spasmodic attempts would be of no use; things would have to be done upon a thorough system, and to make it succeed those who do them would have to be prepared to keep up their efforts for a number of years.

Now, in the phrase of the cookery-book, if I may say so—I dare say it has occurred to you already, but I will suggest it to you—there is 'another' and, in my opinion, 'a better way.' If you can get quite young people, instead of going to the cost of expensive training-colleges, if you can board them out with selected cottagers in selected villages, where they would begin to work at the right end, I think that would probably be more effective than any scheme of agricultural establishments in the country and a great deal less expensive. This is merely an idea that has struck me. It may have been put into practice for aught

I know, but while I was thinking over these things last night it occurred to me for the first time. Say you take 1,000 lads (and they must be young) and put them with respectable people—board them out and pay for their living at first until they learn something—you might then, at any rate, get a proportion of good results.

The next question, however, is really the crux of the whole matter, 'whether any system of purchasing land for division into smaller properties which would be of service on a more intensive system of cultivation has been applied in England, and is likely to prove useful? Possibly some syndicate or company has undertaken the purchase and re-sale of land in some counties on these lines.'

I am of opinion that most certainly it would be most likely to prove of service. I am of opinion that most certainly it is the best thing or one of the best things that can be done in this country, and it would be indeed a true charity, and, more than a charity, it would be an enormous benefit to the nation. But here again we are faced with the fact that very large capital and very good management would be required. Another thing is, such experiments must be run upon economic principles; you could do nothing without them; but I hope to say a little more on that presently. You asked me first whether any syndicate or company has undertaken the purchase and re-sale of land in some counties of this island. Yes, they have, and I will give you an instance or two. At Winterborne, in Dorsetshire, Sir Robert Edgcumbe purchased the Rew farm of about 400 acres and sold it out in small holdings, and he was good enough to give me an elaborate report upon the subsequent history of that farm. The results are most encouraging. All the land has been taken up and nearly all the purchase money has been, or is in course of being, paid off. It is a real pleasure to read that most satisfactory report, which, if you care to do so, you can study in my book, 'Rural England.'

That is one case. Then there is the experiment of Major Poore, who has done much the same thing, but under a different system, in Hampshire, and that at an unpromising place, with a very poor water-supply and poor land. Nine or ten years ago he purchased that land at Winterslow and sold it again in lots, and the results are surprising. The population has gone up in Winterslow, while in all the neighbouring villages it has gone down. On this uncompromising spot I found springing up everywhere most excellent houses, and these small holders have been enabled to borrow some £5,000 or £6,000 in order to build these houses. They are living there and putting up dwellings there that no labourer would ever hope or believe that he would have a chance of living in. All these things have happened here because these men have had the opportunity of buying their plots of land under a system of instalments. Now, I ask you why, if that has happened there, it cannot happen pretty well all over England? I will give you another example: the Worcestershire County Council (which is a more enterprising County Council, perhaps, than any other I know of in England) purchased at Catshill certain land, which I visited, and which it has let out to small holders. These small holders used to be people called nailers—that is to say, they manufactured nails by hand, but machinery came in and killed their trade, and they were left at a very low ebb. I went over these holdings and I saw these men working away, everyone of them happy, every one of them contented and doing well, and many of them had built good houses on their plots. Then comes Norfolk; there are some small holdings there, and the men who have been there for a year or two, as far as I could discover (and I spoke to several of them), are doing fairly well. I might give you other examples, but I have no time left to do so.

As I said before, the great thing is to deal with the children, because, as regards the grown-up people, it is simply a waste of money to send to the country those who are

unfitted for agricultural work. I sympathise with your wish to send them there, also I know the extraordinary efforts that will have to be made in handling these young children; but, on the other hand, you cannot expect a grown-up townsman to do good work in the country—a man who has been wandering about the streets for a number of years. I do hope that so far as in you lies you will as much as possible in the future try and keep the country people in the country and not let them rush hither to swell the number of your London poor. We ought to direct our efforts rather to prevention than to cure—that is to say, to keep the country people from coming to the cities; we ought to try to induce those people who are in the country to remain there. Gentlemen, there was one man who took an earnest interest in this question, and who did his best to interest his colleagues therein and who spared himself no labour in order to acquaint himself with all these problems. I allude to the late Mr. Hanbury; but unfortunately by the decree of Providence he has been suddenly removed from us, which is one of those misfortunes that seem to pursue British agriculture with so swift and sure a foot. Before his death he asked me to work with him towards these ends, and I was in hopes that he would be able to do something in the directions I have alluded to to-day, but he has gone, and now the whole thing has to be begun afresh. You are people of authority; you have many connections, and I do hope you will do your best to bring these questions forward, and that you will especially try to bring forward this problem of the number of people from the country who are seeking employment in the cities, with the view of the discovery and application of remedies. I have no more to say, or rather no time to say more, except to express the hope that I have dwelt, not adequately it is true, but to some extent usefully upon these matters, which you have been so good as to submit for my consideration.

H. R. H.

VII

PAST EXPERIENCE IN RELIEF WORKS

Various conditions have been laid down from time to time by those who have advocated relief works as a means for meeting distress caused by want of employment. The following are some of the principles on which most stress has been laid; it will be seen that they are not always compatible with each other:—

1. The work must be really useful, or it will degrade the worker.
2. It must be of such a nature that all can do it.
3. Good value must be given by the workers.
4. Less than the market wage must be paid, for fear of attracting the worker from his proper work.
5. The wage paid must be the market (or union) wage, or the industrial worker will be undersold.
6. The work must be a step towards the permanent assistance of the worker, and not merely a temporary job needed to be repeated each year.
7. The work must not be such as would otherwise be undertaken by private enterprise.

The following experiments illustrate the difficulty of fulfilling any, still less all, of these conditions:—

Employment by Public Gardens Association.

In the Mansion House Conference, 1887–8, it was decided that it was desirable to organise a scheme for the employment of the unemployed which should avoid the objections

commonly made to relief works in general. The conditions were that labourers should be employed as far as possible on the same terms on which they would be engaged in the open market. No work should be undertaken which was not useful and desirable for its own sake. The work must not be a mere temporary job, but must be connected with and lead up to other remedies of a permanent character. An opportunity for carrying out the scheme was afforded by the Metropolitan Gardens Association, which for two previous winters had given work to the unemployed, paying them partly out of its own funds, partly from grants made from the Mansion House Fund of 1886. The men had been paid at the rate of 4*d.* an hour and a 4*d.* meal, being slightly above the market rate, and it was estimated that the work cost four times what it would have cost if done by contract (Report on Exceptional Distress). Lord Meath now offered to employ 1,300 men at a total cost of £20,000; and the Lord Mayor accordingly appealed in the *Times* for that sum. Only £5,303 was subscribed, and tickets for work were given to 456 men.

In order that the scheme might be made of permanent benefit to those employed, a Reference Sub-Committee was appointed to investigate the case of each man, and consider how he might be helped 'so that when next winter comes he may not again be found in the ranks of the unemployed.' This Committee, reporting in the following summer as to the results of the scheme, states that of the 456, 62 did not present themselves for work; 134 were dismissed for misconduct or incapacity or continued absence; 164 the Committee were unable to raise from their present position; 17 left for better employment; 26 were emigrated, and 53 were assisted in other ways. The Committee, in deploring the result of the scheme, point out that hardly any of the men belonged to a Trade or Friendly Society, though many earned a fairly high wage for most of the year; also that many, even of those willing to work, were undisciplined and with no

capacity for continued exertion. Miss Octavia Hill, speaking afterwards of the same scheme, said that the work fell into the hands of the loafers and did no good, whereas a contractor would have brought in honest, industrious men.

Abbey Mills.

In 1892 another Mansion House Conference initiated a similar scheme of relief works, confined to the special class of displaced casual dock labourers, with a view to their permanent reinstatement in industrial life. The work was for a fortnight only, and was intended as a test; it consisted chiefly in digging, the London County Council having provided land for the purpose on their Abbey Mills estate at Stratford. It was said that of the casual dock labourers referred to there were between 6,000 and 7,000; of these, between 700 and 800 applied for the work, and all but 365 were rejected as unsuitable. Of these 365, it was found possible to help with a view to permanent improvement only 86, and an inquiry some months after showed that of these again, only 40 had been really helped, *i.e.* raised out of the casual labour class by emigration or otherwise. The cost of the experiment was £1,315, of which £732 was spent on the test work. It was thought by one of the Hon. Secretaries to the Committee that better results could have been attained by spending the whole of the money on assisting cases selected by careful inquiry, and without the intervention of relief works.

Nevertheless, it was decided to resume the work in 1894 under slightly different conditions. The limitation to dock labourers was removed, and it was open to anyone in the Tower Hamlets to apply. Those who did apply were 414 in number, of whom only 141 were accepted. Of these, the proportion permanently assisted after the work was still smaller than in the previous year. (Evidence before Select Committee, 1895. 11,262.)

In 1895 the scheme was open to the whole metropolis, but of those who applied only 85 were accepted. The work

was continued for three months—*i.e.* was no longer merely test work; the total cost was £780; and it was suggested that about half were permanently benefited, but there was no subsequent inquiry to ascertain this.

Wanstead.

In 1893–4 experiments were made in West Ham and Poplar: £1,000 being raised by public subscription, and another £1,000 being given by the municipal authorities in each case. The West Ham Committee instituted relief works on Wanstead Flats (levelling the ground), where men were to be employed for four days a week for six hours a day at 6*d.* an hour. 'The amount of pay being small, and the amount of time being small, it is expected that we shall not draw from the ordinary channels of industry working men able to get better employment in their own trade' . . . It was also hoped to avoid other evils of relief works by getting good value for the wages paid. 'Directly you get no value for money paid everyone admits you are doing harm, but if you get full value for your money upon the works, actual value to the neighbourhood, then it seems to me you are doing an unmixed good, and you are helping people at the time when they want it, in the most honest way.'

After the first year's experience Mr. Hills, who was practically conducting the experiment, expressed his dissatisfaction with the result on the ground that at West Ham the work had cost about 50 per cent. more than if it had been carried out under ordinary conditions. In Poplar, where the work had been of various kinds within the district, it had cost 100 per cent. more; and he came to the conclusion that the only remedy was to piece the work.

Accordingly the work at Wanstead was resumed in 1894–5 on the basis of a minimum wage of 4*d.* an hour, the work to be measured and priced, and any surplus to be divided amongst those who had earned it. The Town Council, under intimidation, refused to co-operate on this basis, on the ground that it

was not a union wage; and the experiment was entered upon without their assistance. The success was even less than the preceding year, as many of the men were found to earn less than 1*d.* an hour. Mr. Hills maintained that their idleness was part of a deliberate attempt to break down the scheme, and Mr. Keir Hardie suggested that the men would have done full work if they had been paid 6*d.* an hour (Select Committee, 1895). It was found necessary to suspend the work for three weeks during the severe frost.

Hadleigh.

As illustrative of the attempts to reinstate the permanently unemployed in industrial life we may note some experiences in connection with the Salvation Army farm colony in Essex. Fourteen men were sent here in connection with the West Ham Relief Fund: half of these returned to the Fund; the other half were thought to have found work in the country, but their subsequent history was not traced (Select Committee, 1895, p. 134).

'The experiment of the Camberwell Guardians in sending inmates of the workhouse to the Salvation Army farm at Hadleigh turned out a failure. 110 were sent. At the end of "the experimental period" only 34 were at work, and half of these had been there only for a month or two. What success might be achieved in regard to the 34 was unknown. Of the 76, all except 15 returned to the workhouse; of the 15, three obtained work, and the rest are probably in other workhouses.' (*C.O. Review*, January 1896.)

Undeterred by this failure other Boards tried the same experiment, and in 1898 we have the following report from the Local Government Board Inspector: 'The experiment,' he writes, 'has, so far, not proved very successful, as of the paupers so dealt with 90 per cent. have sooner or later returned to the more congenial haven of the workhouses still incorrigible and unredeemed. Of the remaining 10 per cent.,

the Salvation Army Authorities have, so far as I am aware, nothing in the nature of a complete record.'

Somewhat better results are achieved on Mr. Walter Hazell's farm. He takes only a few men at a time—about eight—and does not pretend to achieve great things; nevertheless he can show a certain amount of assured success.

Effects of Piece-work.

In 1893 Millbank Prison was being demolished, and it was decided to reserve one pentagon to be demolished by the unemployed, the works being opened in the midst of the Tower Hill demonstration, when there was a cry of scarcity of work at the docks. It is not stated how many men were employed, but a census being taken of the occupations of 120 of them showed that only one was a docker. They were paid at the rate of $6\frac{1}{2}d.$—about half the regular wage in the trade; nevertheless their work cost about twice as much as when done by contract. When a change was made to piece-work nearly twice as much was done.

In Glasgow in 1895 a large number of men were employed at stone-breaking, receiving 1*s.* a day and their meals On March 2, 1,465 men were working under these conditions; on the 4th piece-work was introduced, and the number fell to 621. The Lord Provost, giving evidence before the Select Committee, urges strongly that after the first week all men should be put on piece-work, adding: 'During my term of office we have had two occasions on which we have had relief works, and the instant we applied piece-work the men melted away like snow.'

Local Experiences.

The winter of 1895 is memorable in London for something very like a panic amongst local authorities with reference to the unemployed. In several districts, notably Poplar, they yielded to intimidation. At Poplar both the District Board and the Board of Guardians gave employment

relief—namely, in the stone-yards. The Guardians spent on the yards £2,877; an analysis of the first £1,100 spent showed that only £342 of it had reached the men as relief. The demand for the work was very great, it was found impossible to discriminate, and the amount of work was limited to two days in the week. The payment was not wages, but relief, 2*s.* 6*d.* a day for single men, 3*s.* 6*d.* for married men and additional for their families. The work was continued until March 30.

In St. Olave's the labour yard was opened on January 7. Men were employed at first two days, afterwards one day a week, with 3*s.* 6*d.* a day relief; men with families proportionately longer. Every ton of stone broken cost the union £7 (the contract price of broken granite was quoted in Kensington in 1893 as 12*s.* 4*d.* a ton), and £17,000 was spent. The Chairman of the Board stated: 'You could not get the men to do anything—the class of men who were there. I know some who would have honestly endeavoured to do the work, but they were terrorised.'

In St. Pancras great pressure was put on the Guardians to open the labour yard. It was opened for a week; 250 men were employed for three days a week at 6*d.* an hour in a seven hours' day. At the end of the first week it was found that over £100 had been paid them for work valued at £12. The men were 'old stagers and steady relief-seekers,' and after a second week the yard was summarily closed.

In Camberwell hundreds of able-bodied unemployed besieged the Vestry, which opened a register of names and addresses of men to be set to work on the roads. Postcards, sometimes as many as 800 or 1,000 a day, were sent to the men in rotation. No inquiry was made as to the correctness of the addresses or other points. Consequently, it is said, many gave false names and different addresses, and these would obtain three or four days' work, while the honest men had not enough to be of use.

New South Wales.

In conclusion we may note the experience of New South Wales in dealing with the unemployed. There is in force there a very elaborate system by which any man may register himself as unemployed, and is classified according to his trade or calling. To every man thus registered work is offered in rotation. In June, 1902, 13,076 were on the books, and 305 were set to work. In their Report for the year ending June, 1902, the Labour Commissioners state that of 9,589 offers of work made, only 4,469 were accepted. The Commissioners go on to urge strongly that for relief purposes stone-breaking depôts should be instituted, the work to be piece-work and paid strictly by results.

> If such a system were initiated, although it might be costly in itself for the work done, it would release the Government from continually increasing demands for public works to absorb the unemployed, it would allow no citizen to suffer privation, and would abolish the unemployed as a political question within a short time.

English experience seems hardly to bear out this optimistic view of stone-yards, and perhaps the total result of our experience may best be summed up by the following extract from the Board of Trade Report on Agencies and Methods for dealing with the Unemployed (1893):—

> It appears to be conclusively shown . . . that the offer of work without discrimination to all applicants is likely to attract large numbers of a class for whom it is unlikely to be of permanent benefit. . . . Some persons have objected to stringent inquiry as inquisitorial, and doubtless such inquiry needs much tact and judgment. Perhaps, however, the evils which have resulted from its absence or insufficiency may be considered to outweigh any objections of this kind. It does not appear that the mere test of work, in any form in which it is likely to be applied, is a complete or satisfactory substitute for inquiry if the permanent assistance of the individual be the ultimate object in view.
>
> Secondly, it would appear that the success or otherwise of the

relief works themselves is very largely a question of supervision and administration. More foremen and gangers, and more careful (though not harsher) discipline seem to be required than on ordinary work, whereas in practice there is often a tendency for the management to be less strict.

Thirdly, if we regard the provision of work as a test of willingness to labour, it would appear that, other things being equal, the best shape which it can take is that which shall provide the most effective test for the purpose. Now the most searching of tests appears to be *continuity of employment*. Loafers and tramps are not unwilling to do a couple of days' work—even hard work; and many who will work for weeks together three days in each week would be weeded out if they were compelled to work every day. This being so, schemes which merely provide a few days' work for a large number of men in successive relays are of all others the most likely to be abused. They offer work in the form which exactly suits those who are unwilling to submit to continuous exertion, while doing very little for those really in distress. The plan of employing men in two shifts—three days a week each—is recommended on the ground that it gives them a chance to look out for work during the rest of the week; but against this very real advantage must be set the encouragement offered to loafers by an arrangement which falls in with their habits.

To sum up, the special danger which temporary schemes of municipal employment have to face is that they may fail to attract the class of unemployed whose distress is merely caused by temporary difficulties over which the individuals have no control, while they are unlikely to be organised and administered with sufficient completeness and elasticity to enable them to be of service for the lasting assistance or reformation of the chronically idle and incapable.

H. B.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

VIII

EMIGRATION AND WANT OF EMPLOYMENT

Is Emigration a cure or a palliative for want of employment?

That depends first on who and what manner of people they are who are in want of employment. Colonial agents and colonists generally say they want the very best workmen to emigrate. The answer is that the very best workmen are never out of employment, and as a rule will not go, for the very good reason that they are better off at home, and probably earn higher wages than they would get anywhere else. The bulk of applicants for help to emigrate may be divided roughly into three classes:—

(1) Steady, thrifty men who are moderately good workmen.

(2) Thriftless, but not vicious men and not habitual drunkards, of various degrees of excellence as workmen.

(3) Those who from moral or physical defects are practically unemployable.

The third and last class are impossible as emigrants. Whatever a man is, emigration tends to make him more so—tends to confirm his habits by giving them scope for development, not to change them. It is hopeless to attempt to cure a drunken or a lazy man by emigrating him. Such, at least, is the general rule. But for the man inclined to drink, but not yet a confirmed drunkard, Canada may, under favourable circumstances, offer a better chance for recovery than the Old

Country, for the habits of the Dominion are on the whole more temperate, among the women especially. The same cannot, I think, be said of Australia, but the contrary.

We have generally to deal, therefore, with the other two classes—the steady, fairly good workman, and the thriftless but not vicious. And we have to trust to the patience and discrimination of the District Committees to ascertain for us the characters of the applicants, which, if they are in the second class, is often difficult.

Practically it is almost always the pressure of want, actual or prospective—want estimated at a higher or lower standard according to the individual and the class he belongs to—that is the moving cause for emigration. In good times, when employment is plentiful and well paid, as was the case in the decade from 1891–1901, the numbers leaving the country, either at their own expense or by the help of charitable societies, is comparatively small. In bad times the number goes up, and our Society gets a fair proportion of applicants from Class 1 as well as from Class 2.

Much difference of opinion exists as to the amount and degree of distress and want of employment at the present time in London. The District Committees of this Society have lately sent in carefully considered reports, each as regards its own district, on this subject. I think they may be summarised thus: There is not in most districts much more than the usual amount of distress and want of work at this time of year; but in some there *is* more, and in others considerably more. And there are in some trades, and notably in the building trade, and also among the Dockyard engineers and workmen at Woolwich, more *good* men out of work than for many years past. In these trades want of employment has affected a higher class than usually falls out of work in depressed times. And, moreover, there is an uneasy feeling that the depression is not merely temporary, and that the outlook is gloomy.

I am sorry to say that amongst our most urgent cases are

not a few old Army men, Reservists and Volunteers, who have served in the war. Of the two latter classes many have not had the opportunity of taking up the work they were doing before the war, trade being generally more slack now than it was then. Or they came home invalided, and so fell into difficulties. Considering the obligation we owe to these men, considering the extremity of difficulty the country would have been in three years ago had they, and such as they, not come forward, I think it is our bounden duty to assist them to the utmost of our power, and when we have done so, to count them still our creditors and not our debtors.

It would be out of place to-day—indeed it would be quite beyond my powers—to go, in detail, into the question of the causes which have led to the present distress and want of employment. Want of thrift, of course, is always the chief cause of poverty and distress. Considering the abundance of employment, the comparatively high wages, and the low price of necessaries—always excepting house-rent—during the decade 1891–1901, it is disappointing to find how little solid ground has been gained in this respect. As regards London, there can be no doubt that the inconsiderate lavishness of some of the Boards of Guardians has aggravated the situation by encouraging the less thrifty portion of the working class to look to Out-door Relief in time of pressure as a matter of course, and to squander savings which might have kept them from poverty when bad times came. I cannot help saying that in my humble opinion the attitude of the Local Government Board has from time to time materially contributed to this state of things. I would instance the Board's hesitating and uncertain action in regard to unearned old-age State pensions, which has operated calamitously—I can use no milder term—in discouraging the members of Friendly Societies from contributing for a pension wherever there is a scheme for pensions, or of starting a scheme where there was not one already. I would instance Mr. Chaplin's Outdoor

Relief Minute and Circular of two and a half years ago; and last, but not least, Sir E. Strachey's 'Friendly Societies and Out-door Relief' Bill, brought in, for the third time, this year, by which it is proposed that the rates and the machinery of Out-door Relief shall be utilised—not as a last resource for the destitute, but as a sort of prize fund out of which premiums are to be awarded to members of Friendly Societies—and to nobody else—who are thrifty but not *too* thrifty. (Those who are too thrifty to have to apply for relief get no premiums!) Such an attitude is equivalent to saying to the Friendly Society men, 'You shall have a prize for thrift on condition of your becoming a pauper!' [1]

If the spirit of the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834 had been alive in the Local Government Board for the last decade we should have more men in what I have called Class I. and fewer in Class II.; and it would be easier for us to-day to find good emigrants for Canada than it is.

The applications for assistance to emigrate which have come before us this year, both by their greatly increased numbers and by the extreme poverty and the inability of most of the applicants to contribute anything towards the cost of their passages, certainly indicate an unusual amount of want of employment and destitution.

In 1898–9 we helped out only forty-one persons, the smallest number we ever sent in a year. In 1900–1 there were seventy. Last year they rose to 126, nearly all the increase being to Canada. This year the number promises to be much larger. Applications are coming in at a rate we never had before. Since January 1st we have sent out, or decided to send out, ninety-nine persons. At the present time applications are coming in at the rate of something like fifty a week.[2]

[1] The Bill was again thrown out by a small majority in the House of Lords.

[2] This was written in February 1903. During the year 1902–3 450 emigrants were sent out by the Committee, nearly all going to Canada.

Already several of them have gone to Canada some six weeks earlier than usual, for in that country so many large works, public and private, have recently been undertaken, and so brisk, beyond all precedent, is the demand for labour of almost all kinds, that we can be sure of our people obtaining work as soon as they arrive, although farming operations may not yet have begun.

This increase of numbers involves a corresponding increase of expenditure, the more so because many of this year's applicants have come to the end of their savings and can contribute little towards the cost of their passage. Now, since the work of this Sub-Committee began in 1886, we have never refused an application, eligible in other respects, on account of expense (I do not say that in a doubtful case the balance may not now and then have turned against it on account of its expense), but no really good case has ever been rejected solely on that ground. In sixteen years we have assisted 2,892 persons to emigrate. These, be it remembered, were nearly all young people, so that by this time they and their offspring may perhaps amount to two or three times that number. The numbers in each year have varied greatly —in bad times many, in good times few. We began in 1886–7 with 466, and went down gradually but irregularly to forty-one, the lowest point, in 1898–9, towards the close of the prosperous decade. When our numbers were low we cut down our working expenses to the utmost, and continued to go on with the funds supplied by our very small list of regular subscribers. When we had many applications we made an appeal to the public. The last time we so appealed was in November 1888, more than fourteen years ago. We think that this long interval and existing requirements justify us in making an appeal now.

I think that we may say with confidence that of our 2,892 emigrants all but a very few have succeeded, many of them having passed from poverty almost amounting to destitution

to a high degree of comfort and prosperity. I must confess —though I fear some of my colleagues may not approve—to a certain degree of satisfaction in having a few—a *very* few—failures, because it is an indication that we do not set our standard too high. Inquire as you will, you cannot appraise a man's character with absolute accuracy. I had rather send out one unrighteous man with forty-nine righteous than reject the whole fifty because I cannot ascertain which among them is the one black sheep. But this by the way. The tone of nearly all the letters we receive is remarkable for an absence of grumbling, which in an average Briton indicates an almost superlative degree of contentment. Perhaps the best proof of their success has been the great number of invitations sent to their friends at home to go out and join them, which are continually being brought to us.

There can, I think, be no question of the benefit conferred on these persons, and also of the advantages, *pro tanto*, obtained by the Colonies which required their labour. But it may be objected that—taking a wider view—emigration is not a cure for want of employment, because bad times come to a colony as well as to an old populous country. With reservations I, of course, admit that. We have heard for years past, at intervals, of hundreds of unemployed men at Sydney and elsewhere being supported by Government and being paid 6*s*. or 7*s*. a day for doing, or not doing, a small modicum of unnecessary public work. But all the time work was to be had up the country, on the land, at a wage which, though somewhat reduced, would have been considered an ample one in the Old Country; and had Government so-called employment been refused, there would have been a stimulus to agriculture instead of to laziness. In a country of good agricultural capability, sparsely populated, I venture to think that it can hardly happen, even at the most depressed times, that surplus labour cannot be absorbed at a wage sufficient at the worst to place a man far beyond the reach of actual want, if only

the Government will leave the 'unemployed' alone. If I am right, it follows that in emigration, if it could be carried out on a sufficiently large scale, lies a solution to a great extent of what is called the problem of the unemployed, so far as relates to those of them who are employable.

And apart from the question of the 'unemployed,' it is surely much to be desired that the population of the Empire should be more evenly distributed, less crowded together in one little corner. How many of the difficulties of life in England are directly attributable to its too great density? There is the housing question, the fear of famine in case of a naval war, the undue preponderance of townspeople over country people, with the consequent loss of vigour in the race, the daily brain-wearying railway journeys rendered necessary by the size of the towns, the destructive aggression of the builder upon scene after scene of natural beauty. All that is a very old story, but none the less a true one. In 1883 the gross total of British and Irish emigrants from the United Kingdom reached 320,000. The total increase of population—that is, the excess of births over deaths—may be put roughly at 1,000 a day. So that the time seemed to be approaching when possibly a stationary condition of the population might be looked for, if not even a slight depletion. It was a vain hope! From that year there has been a gradual, though irregular diminution of emigrants. Through the prosperous decade of 1891–1901 it grew less, reaching its lowest in 1898 with 140,000. But these are the gross figures. There are large deductions of immigrants to be made. In 1898 there were no less than 91,000 immigrants to deduct from the 140,000 emigrants, leaving a balance of less than 50,000, or a little more than an eighth of the natural increase. But with the depression of the last year or two the tide has turned. The total for 1902 is 205,000, with a deduction for immigration of 104,000, or more than half.

One would have thought that the increased and improved acquaintance and communication with our Colonies would

have led to a different result. Some surprises may yet be in store for us in Canada or in South Africa. But doubtless we are too comfortable at home to wish to uproot on a large scale —sensibly more comfortable in each succeeding decade. And I am afraid it seems as if nothing but the sharp spur of absolute necessity would drive us to execute more rapidly the command to 'replenish the earth and subdue it.'

J. M.

IX

MUNICIPAL LABOUR BUREAUX

The scope of this paper is a limited one. Its aim is to raise a discussion upon the utility, true function, and line of development of Labour Bureaux in England. Although the due consideration of the subject cannot be confined to London, the writer of the paper claims no personal knowledge of the working of such Provincial Bureaux as have already been started. Nor is it proposed to discuss the Bureaux of France, Germany, the United States, and Australasia, important as these are in relation to the industrial conditions to which they relate. Those conditions differ in essential particulars from those obtaining in Great Britain, and their consideration would exclude more vital questions nearer home.

If we look at the aims of those who have advocated Labour Bureaux in this country we shall find the widest divergence of opinion, from the purely philanthropic objects and voluntary methods of the Rev. Wm. Tozer, the founder of the well-known Ipswich Labour Bureau, down to the chief resolution of the Guildhall Conference on the Unemployed, whose terms I will venture to quote. 'The responsibility,' runs the resolution, 'for finding work for the unemployed in each district should be undertaken jointly by the Local Authorities and by the Central Government, and such legislation should be introduced as would empower both Central and Local Authorities to deal adequately with the problem.'

The promoters of that Conference charge the Labour Registration officers with two duties unknown either to the

voluntary Bureaux or to the Labour Bureaux (London) Act of 1902. They are, first, to ascertain as accurately as may be the number and occupations of the unemployed, and, second to co-operate with the Central Government in finding useful work for such unemployed.

Those who have met here this afternoon have been led by no such chimerical suggestions. We are content, I take it, to accept, provisionally at least, the more practicable formula of the Act of 1902, which defines a Labour Bureau as 'an office or place used for the purpose of supplying information, either by the keeping of registers or otherwise, respecting employers who desire to engage workpeople, and workpeople who seek engagement or employment.'

Such a Bureau is neither a charitable nor a political agency. It takes its place as a distributive agent in the social economy, and as an economic distributive agency it must stand or fall. The idea that the State can make itself responsible for providing work for all who need it is not entirely new to English law. That the State should do this for all destitute persons, but that it should couple such work with ineligible conditions is a leading provision of the English Poor Law. But that the State should undertake such a responsibility except under these conditions is too discredited a doctrine to need refutation. As, however, it is the doctrine which underlies much of the demand for State Labour Bureaux, it must be mentioned here in order to be repudiated.

The second proposal in regard to Labour Bureaux—that relating to what General Booth has called 'The regimentation of the unemployed'—has allured many philanthropists. 'Let us know exactly who are the unemployed, and then we can deal with them.' Such statistics, however, would be worthless unless they were, for a locality, fairly exhaustive. To make them so, the registrars, after determining exactly what they mean by 'unemployed,' must enrol all the unemployed, and none but the unemployed; and they must

verify in each case the degree of unemployment. This would be a gigantic task if it were confined to *bonâ-fide* workmen unemployed or casually employed; but such an enrolment would not deal adequately with the subject unless it included the loafing and vagrant classes. Nor is it easy to suggest any motive short of compulsion that would induce these various classes to enrol themselves. Finally, supposing all these difficulties to be overcome, what useful object would be served? We should have a numerical expression for an evil whose character has been carefully analysed, and the removal of which is known to depend, so far as it is at all practicable, upon wide-reaching reforms in our social, fiscal, industrial, and educational systems. Towards these reforms a mere numerical analysis will avail but little.

But the philanthropist too often wants not merely the statistics for argument, but the men to relieve. Here again the Labour Bureau, if it is to justify itself as an economic experiment, must sternly refuse. Directly the attempt is made to use the Bureau as a means of relief, its economic function tends to break down by loss of credit with the employing class. Several of the Labour Bureaux in London contain in their form of application a space for the number of the applicant's family. This is, we must suppose, a survival from the Labour Registers started in the early nineties. These were largely the result of Mr. Fowler's Circular recommending co-operation between Boards of Guardians and Vestries with a view to the employment upon the roads of applicants for relief. In such an application, need, as represented by number of family, would constitute a preferential claim. The Bureaux of the Act of 1902 have no relations with the Guardians. The only needs considered are the need of the employer for a workman and the need of the workman for work.

What then is the relation of the Labour Bureau to the problem of the unemployed?

Four facts meet us on the threshold of the controversy:—

(1) The Bureau cannot directly create a demand for labour.

(2) If so, then in a given state of the labour market the work found for A is lost by B.

(3) The Bureau will be most useful, because labour leakage will be most costly, not when trade is bad, but when trade is good.

(4) The Bureau may tend to relax men's efforts to find work for themselves (although this consideration would apply with almost equal force to the operation of trades unions, which find work for their members). To whatever extent this tendency may operate, it must be regarded as a set-off against the increased fluidity of labour claimed as a product of the Bureaux.

At first sight, then, the connection between Labour Bureaux and the unemployed problem seems remote. That problem, although it is always with us, assumes its acutest form at the bottom of great trade depressions. As such depressions deepen, more labour and capital are thrown out of employment, and, roughly speaking, the less productive will go first. Roughly speaking, the best workmen will retain their work; the less efficient will lose it and will join the chronic unemployed and the casually employed, who lie, roughly speaking again, immediately above the vagrant and pauper strata of society.

The depth of a depression in trade, then, determines the number of men thrown out of work, and the industrial efficiency of the individual workman determines whether he or another man shall drop out of the ranks. The same is true of the minor depressions caused by changes of fashion, machinery, locale, and season; by wars, natural disasters, and other incalculable events. In every case the balance of apparently superfluous labour (unprovided for by out-of-work benefit) is the field of the Labour Bureau. Looked at from

this point of view the scope of the Labour Bureau seems hopelessly small. Four conditions, however, tend to justify its existence:—

(1) These trade cycles exhibit themselves by constant changes of employment at different times, at different places, and in different trades. Hence the leakage of one may be compensated, especially amongst the lower ranks of labour, from another. It is claimed for Labour Bureaux that by increasing the fluidity of labour they tend to minimise such leakage.

(2) Although it is, generally speaking, true that employment is held by the efficient and lost by the inefficient, the actual exceptions to this law are, from various causes, frequent. Any widespread vehicle for rehabilitating the efficient at the expense of the inefficient adds to general economic efficiency.

(3) In a limited degree it is even possible that a ready means of securing labour may cause the revival, or prevent the decay, of an industry. Some of the more energetic superintendents of Bureaux in London have already responded to the still somewhat inarticulate appeal for labourers from rural districts by sending men 'Back to the Land.' Many labourers who once found the country insupportable may be found by the Bureaux willing to return. Nor can it be denied that the promotion of Forestry by the Government, recommended by the Royal Commission, whose report was lately published, will receive an impetus and gain additional acceptance from the attention drawn to the present state of the labour market.

Application forms at the London Bureaux should contain, amongst others, this question: 'Are you willing to accept work in the country at a reasonable wage?' A list of such men, collected by a central Labour Bureau, would at least test the demand for labour said to prevail in certain rural districts.

(4) *Statistics.*—An additional function of the Bureaux

might consist in the collection and diffusion of statistics of industry. The unions of the more highly skilled ranks of labour find work for their own members, and they collect and return valuable industrial statistics. In acting as the medium between employers on the one hand and less skilled and less organised labour on the other, the Bureaux might also, if properly worked, accumulate valuable statistics and give local publicity to the important facts to be found in the pages of the *Labour Gazette*. This, under skilled management, might become quite the most important department of the work.

If there is a case for making an experiment in Labour Bureaux, it seems desirable that they should be under public control; not because a Municipal Bureau is likely to be more skilfully worked than a voluntary one (indeed, the evidence, so far as its goes, points in the opposite direction), but because nothing short of a public authority will ensure the confidence of both capital and labour.

In England the serious difficulties arising from the shipping conflicts of the early nineties, during which the employers opened free registries to counter the alleged attempt of the trades unions to monopolise the supply of labour, not only satisfied the Royal Commission on Labour that public registries were the only safe ones, but suggested that under impartial guidance they might obviate some of the worst quarrels between labour and capital. On the other hand, the danger of such machinery falling into the hands of either party—a state of affairs which led to the closing of the Bourse du Travail in Paris in 1887—shows how tentatively such a movement should proceed.

On the whole, then, it seems worth while to try the experiment in connection with the Borough Councils, especially as the more extended organisation the municipalities afford gives promise of greater success than the scattered and isolated units hitherto at work. One thing, however, must be borne in mind. The Labour Bureaux are on their trial. If they are to succeed they must

be pushed with something of the vigour, enterprise, and patient attention to detail which characterise the non-municipal Bureaux. These qualities may not be available, or Borough Councils may shrink from the cost, or they may decline the voluntary co-operation that might save the money and supply the necessary interest. An impartial observer going the round of the Bureaux sees some worked with intelligence and enthusiasm by men whose hearts are in the work, and whose whole time is retained. Other Bureaux, worked in some cases with more method, show a mechanical and restricted effort that can only end in failure.

Of the Labour Bureaux that were in operation before the Act of 1902, that of Chelsea was closed in 1895 on the ground of expense.* That of St. Martin's survives as that of Westminster. That of Battersea has been open since 1892, and the one at Hackney since 1894. Of those that have been created by the Act of 1902 (which provides that the expenses of Labour Bureaux shall be paid out of the general rate) :—

The Bethnal Green Bureau was opened in November 1902;

„ Poplar †
„ St. Pancras
„ Stepney
} †Bureaux were opened in December 1902;

„ Hammmersmith
„ Holborn (?)
„ Lambeth
„ Southwark
„ Westminster
} „ „ „ January 1903;

„ Bermondsey
„ Fulham
„ Shoreditch
} „ „ „ February 1903;

„ Finsbury Bureau was opened in March 1903.

Lewisham and Woolwich have opened registers only. Hampstead and Kensington contemplate opening Bureaux.

These Bureaux are open for varying hours during the

* £162 per annum. † Re-opened.

morning for men. The afternoons are, as a rule, divided between the reception of women candidates and the work of canvassing amongst employers. Candidates fill up a form, giving name, age, address, occupation required, and trade or calling. Other items occurring on the form in different boroughs are: Place and time of last employment; Where employed before that; Number of family dependent; Length of time out of work; Reason for leaving last situation; Wages required; When disengaged; Average weekly earnings; How long resident in borough.

Employers are canvassed personally and by circular. Registers are kept of candidates and of employers. Various forms are in use for intimating when an engagement has been effected; but the complaint is that these are not invariably used. In at least one Union a fee of 1*d.* is charged for registration. In another a fee of 2*d.* is contemplated. In some, domestic servants are excluded. Testimonials are, I believe, nowhere asked for, and practically no inquiry is made.

Candidates' names are kept on the books sometimes for a week, sometimes for a fortnight, after which a notice of renewal must be sent. But many of the newly formed Bureaux have not yet taken any names off their books. The expense is difficult to estimate at so early a stage. No Councils, apparently, expect to exceed £170 per annum. In some cases, where the duty of Superintendent of Bureau is attached to some other post and the clerk-work done by his department, the expense is trifling, not exceeding £20 or £30 per annum. The management of the Bureau is generally entrusted to a sub-committee of one of the chief Standing Committees. The Bureaux make an increasing use of the telephone for intercommunication.

These details of method and other points upon which opinion is divided may conveniently be considered under separate headings.

(1) *Management.*—It seems desirable that in some cases, especially where sufficient interest has not been aroused on

the Council, the Committee of Management should have power to co-opt residents in the borough of special experience. This power would be particularly useful in boroughs where voluntary Labour Bureaux already existed, whose co-operation would be desirable.

(2) *Staff and Expense.*—If the thing is to be done at all, it would appear necessary that the full responsibility of working the Bureaux should be thrown upon one man, the whole of whose time should be devoted to the work. And in order that he may be hampered as little as possible by formal book-keeping, a clerk should be allowed. For the superintendent's time must be chiefly spent in interviewing candidates, canvassing employers, visiting men's clubs and places where men are taken on, and in studying local industrial conditions. The plan of one Council, in a great industrial borough, has been to saddle the chief Librarian with the charge of the Bureau. The candidates are beautifully catalogued on a card index, alphabetically under their trades. The expense has been next to nothing. In the first four days 2,000 candidates were registered. In the three months following only 500. Compare this borough with a suburban one neither very rich nor very poor. The superintendent's morning is spent in his Bureau and with his candidates; his afternoons in canvassing employers. His returns, which are complete for seven weeks, are instructive. Like the borough aforementioned, he was inundated the first week with 264 candidates, and obtained work for three. In the six remaining weeks, during which his applications averaged 47 per week, his percentages of employment found for fresh candidates ran thus: 9 per cent., 16 per cent., 42 per cent., 39 per cent., 58 per cent., and finally 33 per cent. The week in which he had most applications he secured the smallest percentage of employment. The week in which he had fewest applications his percentage of employment was highest. The figures may indicate that the weeks of least pressure were those in which

the superintendent was able to canvass most successfully for work, or they may merely state numerically the truism that there was least unemployment when the demand for work was most brisk. But the comparison of the last four weeks with the first three is certainly encouraging, as showing sustained and successful work.

(3) *Inquiry.*—A certain minimum of inquiry seems necessary to verify residence and so to prevent overlapping. Inquiry into industrial character is made by such diverse organisations as the Polytechnic, the Ipswich Bureau, and the Salvation Army ; but, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is made by no municipal Bureau. Yet, if it is not made, one of the chief justifications of Labour Bureaux—viz., that they may help to replace inefficient by efficient workers—loses much of its weight. On the other hand, inquiries into character are better made by the employer than by a third party, especially when the third party is a municipal authority.

(4) *Registers.*—Surely the candidates should be registered both alphabetically and according to trades. Yet this seemingly essential classification is curiously neglected.

(5) *Trade Associations and Trades Unions.*—It remains to be seen what part employers' associations and trades unions will take in the Labour Bureaux. The attitude of these bodies towards them will probably decide their fate. At present relations are friendly all round. But the municipal and voluntary Bureaux take up somewhat different attitudes towards trade disputes. The former, as in the case of St. Pancras and the strike of the tramway men, ignore the existence of disputes. The latter, so far as I can ascertain, steer clear of them. The extreme difficulty of deciding what is a trade dispute and what is a merely personal dispute between an employer and one or more men inclines one to the municipal attitude.

(6) *Federation.*—It seems very generally desired that some form of federation should be effected, preferably by the London County Council, between the various voluntary and

municipal Bureaux of the metropolis. Such a federation united by a Central Bureau might :—

(1) Effect some sort of division of labour. Some of the Bureaux, like the Polytechnic and the Women's Bureaux, are already organised for special departments of work, whilst such a class as domestic servants might, with advantage, be relegated to the ordinary registries ;

(2) Appoint one or more inspectors, who would simplify and correlate methods and verify results ;

(3) Advise and organise the combination of small boroughs to share the expense of one Bureau ;

(4) Communicate to country correspondents lists, collected from the boroughs, of London workmen able and willing to undertake work in the provinces ;

(5) Aid generally in the collection of industrial statistics from the boroughs ;

(6) Convene conferences of superintendents and others interested in Bureaux.

I have endeavoured in this paper to give an impartial account of the hopes of the various promoters of Labour Bureaux ; to weigh their possible utility ; to give a brief account of their present position ; to indicate a few of the points in their management upon which authorities differ ; and to suggest certain developments which seem essential to a fair trial of the system.

Whether the Bureaux will emerge from that period of trial successfully depends, within certain economic limits, upon the energy and wisdom of their managers and superintendents. At present Labour Bureaux are in their infancy—embryonic —sporadic. We must accept them not for what they are, but for what they may become.

The Stepney Borough Council has adopted the ingenious device of issuing its appeal for the co-operation of employers along with the demand note for the rates. To those who are struck by the humour of this combination the situation it suggests may be presented as a summary of the writer's state of suspended judgment on the subject. T. H. N.

X

INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIP AND THE PREVENTION OF DISTRESS

At the two days' Conference on the Unemployed in the City a few weeks ago one of the speakers said he had no faith in the nostrums proposed, but that the remedy was to be found in employers paying higher wages when trade was good, which would enable the recipients to put by something to meet periods of depression. This must have been a random expression, for surely that speaker knows that the last thing that occurs to ordinary workmen, as a rule, is to provide for the future in this way. They are not gifted with the foresight and prudence of a Joseph, for if they were the difficulty under discussion would largely disappear.

The subject is wide and far-reaching. To attempt to deal with it at all thoroughly would require a treatise rather than a short paper, and a far abler pen and greater knowledge and experience than I possess. Sympathy with working people in their difficulties and anxieties and a desire to help them to improve their position in life even to a small extent is my only claim to a hearing. 'The poor ye have always with you,' but we are considering those who might be removed from the ranks of poverty and thus prevent so much distress that the remainder could be dealt with easily.

The subject, or rather the title given by Mr. Loch, 'Industrial Partnership and the Prevention of Distress,' associates ideas whose connection is scarcely apparent.

How industrial partnership is to prevent distress is a difficult question to answer. What is industrial partnership?

It is much more than simple profit-sharing, which is but the first step in that direction. Industrial partnership as I understand it in its complete and ultimate form is a real partnership—beyond mere salaries and wages—of capital and labour, of employer and employed in the business in which both are engaged, a partnership in capital, and therefore in the profits on capital, in responsibility and in actual management.

When this becomes general the whole class of workmen will have been lifted to a higher plane. They will be owners of property, and thus removed from the risk of distress due to temporary depressions of trade.

But this is a dream, and any man who thinks it may come true will be regarded as a dreamer. The first step is to dissipate that pessimistic opinion. When the Gas Workers' Union was master in the retort-houses of the South Metropolitan Gas Company in the autumn of 1889 I had a day dream that possibly at some future time we might be again free. Within three months that dream was realised, but it never occurred to me as possible that in a dozen years or so nearly every man would be a shareholder in the Company, that some 4,000 men would possess in the ordinary stock or on deposit with the Company £170,000, or over £40 per man on the average, that numbers of working men who say that they could never previously save a penny are possessors of £100 or more, a good few having become owners of their houses, that three employees—two workmen and one clerk (elected by their shareholding comrades)—would be sitting on the Board and taking part as directors with credit to themselves and with advantage to the Company, that since 1889 a dispute or a difficulty or a difference of any kind between the workmen and the Company has been unknown, and that such a spirit of co-operative goodwill should prevail on the part of the men generally as to entirely relieve all who have to do with them from every trace of anxiety.

This is not an isolated case, for precisely similar results have followed the nine years' working of the system by the Crystal Palace District Gas Company, while there is good promise of the same at the Commercial Gas Company, where the system has been recently introduced.

The same principle has also been adopted at the Gas Works of Chester and Newport, South Wales.

It is said that the circumstances of gas companies are exceptional, that a system suitable to them is unsuitable in other companies and industries, and that this is the reason why it has not been adopted. The answer is that gas companies are just as backward as other undertakings, and with less excuse in not following the example set them and constantly brought to their notice during the last thirteen years. The real reason is want of conviction as to the necessity and advantage of doing something of the kind, or want of will.

Mention must be made of the extremely interesting and valuable work of the Labour Co-partnership Association 'whose object' (using their own words) 'is to bring about an organisation of industry based on the principle of labour co-partnership; that is to say, a system in which all those engaged shall share in the profit, capital, control and responsibility.' They add, 'This system is no mere dream. Independent of the co-partnership steps taken by ordinary businesses, the principle is carried out by British productive businesses, organised by working men, which at the end of 1901 numbered 100; had a capital of £1,480,833; sold in the year £2,947,061 worth of goods; made a profit of £161,694 (after deducting losses); and paid to labour, in addition to provident funds, a sum not easily ascertained, but exceeding £20,500 as labour's share of the results over and above standard wages.'

Neither would it be right to pass over the great pioneer work of Mr. George Thomson, of the firm of William Thomson & Sons, Ltd, of the Woodhouse Mills, Huddersfield, cloth manufacturers. Some seventeen years ago he

converted the business into a co-partnership concern, his workmen becoming shareholders, and having a share by elected directors in the management, with very satisfactory results, particularly in the true spirit of co-partnership manifested by the workers.

The above particulars are given to show that the co-partnership of capital and labour 'is no mere dream,' but a practical solution of a very difficult problem, viz. the reconciliation of those two apparently diverse but really identical interests. If and when this becomes general the question of the prevention of remediable distress will have been solved, and the title of the subject chosen for this afternoon's consideration is therefore justified.

The great weakness of this country is that our great working population, speaking, of course, generally, have no share in its vast accumulated property. They are not property owners. The great strength of France is that the bulk of the population are property owners. Hence the proverbial thriftiness of the French and the thriftlessness of the English. My limited experience tends to show that the striking contrast between the French and English on this point is due to their different circumstances, the French being property owners and the English not. It is this fact that has developed the thrifty spirit in the one and caused its absence in the other.

I have a dream that this difficulty will be removed, and that the twentieth century will do for the English working or wage-earning class what the nineteenth century did for the middle class.

By the aid of the Joint Stock Limited Liability system—the growth of the last century—the great and wealthy middle class of this country has attained its present position. That system has not only given this section of the people the opportunity of investing their savings, but it has at the same time so enormously increased their capacity for saving that the result is what we see to-day.

Unfortunately—most unfortunately—the working class has no part or lot in this great inheritance, and it is my hope and expectation that this grave defect will be removed ere the present century closes—if not, then woe be to Old England.

The wonder is that our wage-earners having no stake in the country are so patriotic, but they are certainly not contented with their lot, and this discontent will grow until it becomes a real danger to the State unless those who have the power and influence to remedy it, viz. the great class of employers, take the matter earnestly and seriously in hand. The trend of the working classes seems to be strongly towards Socialism—the State is to provide and do everything for them—which means ruin all round; but make them property owners and all this is changed, they will certainly become thrifty, and then having a real interest in the country they will take their part in its government with credit to themselves and to its general advantage. In fact, I see no other way of combating Socialism, and this will be effective. Given the opportunity and such encouragement as is possible, our working men are not so thriftless as is commonly supposed. Their thriftlessness is due to the fact that they regard as hopeless any attempt to accumulate, and therefore do not try. When the South Metropolitan Gas Company started their profit-sharing system they gave the men the option of leaving their annual bonus in the Company's hands at interest, and to the surprise and pleasure of all no less than 45 per cent. did save it. This percentage has gradually increased until at the distribution last year it has risen to well over 80 per cent. saved. This is the strength of the system. Had the annual bonuses been regularly withdrawn no permanent good would have resulted to the workmen, and the profit-sharing system would have been a failure and would certainly have been abandoned long ago.

If industrial partnership is to be so great an agent in our industrial life, and incidentally in the prevention of distress,

how is it to be made general and what are the difficulties in the way of its adoption and success?

The first and chief difficulty is that employers generally do not see its importance, and are not, therefore, disposed to take it up and to give the necessary time and attention to secure success; for it certainly will not work itself. It must be worked as earnestly and intelligently as any other branch of their business.

If employers could be enlightened on the subject, the Joint Stock system, by which all great industries are now worked, is just the thing. It is a partnership, and all that is necessary is to include the wage-earners. This can be done as recommended by the Labour Co-partnership Association, by paying the profit-sharing bonus partly, or entirely, in shares in the concern. This is done by the gas companies above referred to, who pay half in the ordinary stock of the company, bought at the market price of the day, while the other half is payable in cash; the greater part of the men, however, as already stated, either leave it on deposit at interest or invest it in stock.

Another difficulty to the introduction of the system is the dislike of the Trade Unions. At this there need be no surprise, for the ultimate success of co-partnership means that employers and employed will be one, and therefore there will be no need for the Trade Union as it now exists. It will, in fact, be superseded by a superior system. There are already some Trade Union leaders in the North of England who have the courage to say that if a better system such as co-partnership supersedes their organisations they will welcome it. At present such men are few in number, and official trade unionism generally is either quietly opposed or actually hostile to all systems of profit-sharing that tend in the direction of partnership.

Partnership in businesses, such as railway and other companies where employment is regular and constant, is, I believe, quite possible and practicable; but where employment is

casual and uncertain the co-partnership system is at present scarcely applicable, and unfortunately from these fluctuating businesses mainly comes the distress caused by want of employment.

Of course, there are many and great difficulties, but there is also great danger to the industrial community and to the State. Something must be done, and it appears clear that it must be in the direction of co-partnership, which I thoroughly believe is the goal of British industry. Employers are doubtless in many cases fearful of the result of bringing their workmen into partnership, which need cause no surprise; but, so far as my experience goes, working men respond most satisfactorily to the trust their employer reposes in them. Confidence begets confidence, and mutual confidence between employer and employed is the foundation of any and all good relations.

If and when the working classes become possessors of property, one indirect effect in the prevention of distress will be that employment will be more regular and constant, or they will be not mere labourers, but, by virtue of their thrift and savings, active promoters of productive industry.

Is my ideal right or wrong? If right, then the co-partnership of capital and labour is worth any effort to make it general as speedily as possible, for, amongst other great advantages that it will bring, may be numbered the prevention of distress. Or the ideal may be right, but the method for its attainment not the best. All that can be said in its favour is that so far it has succeeded beyond expectations. If, however, a better can be found, by all means let it be tried.

If my ideal is wrong, the sooner it is exposed the better. The great advantage of meetings such as this is that they tend to discover truth and to expose error. For that reason I thank the Charity Organisation Society for this opportunity of discussing a very important question.

G. L.

POSTSCRIPT

By request I add the following particulars of the system of profit-sharing or industrial partnership adopted by the Gas Companies referred to in the paper.

Nearly thirty years ago the sliding-scale principle was applied to Gas Companies, whereby the interests of shareholders and consumers are identified. For every reduction of one penny per 1,000 feet in the price of gas below a certain standard or initial figure the shareholders are allowed a small increase of dividend. It is therefore to the interest of the company to sell gas at the lowest possible price, and by that means a partnership was established between shareholders and consumers. This partnership was incomplete, because it did not extend to the employees, but for that the time was not ripe.

In 1889 when the New Socialistic Unionism was rising into power after the great London Dock Strike, the Gas Workers' Union obtained control over gas stokers. The South Metropolitan Company then felt it to be imperative that some effective step should be taken to attach the workmen to the Company, and the profit-sharing system was introduced, which is simply an extension of the sliding scale to the employees. It was at once accepted by all the non-unionists, and the Union then ordered the strike, to compel the withdrawal of profit-sharing, and failed. The standard or initial price of gas, which in the case of the South Metropolitan Gas Company has been fixed by Parliament at 3*s.* 1*d.* per 1,000 feet, is the starting point for both the dividend and the profit-sharing bonus. For every penny at which gas is sold below the standard price the dividend may be increased 2*s.* 8*d.* per cent., and the directors give an annual bonus of three-quarters, or 15*s.*, per cent. on the salaries and wages of all the officers and workmen who enter into agreements to serve the Company for various periods not exceeding twelve months, with a proviso that any individual can leave by

consent (which is always given) at any time. The present selling price of this Company's gas is 2*s.* 3*d.* per 1,000 feet, or 10*d.* below the standard, therefore the annual bonus is at the rate of 7½ per cent. on salaries and wages. By the rules one-half only of the bonus is payable in cash and the other half is invested in the Company's ordinary stock at the market price of the day. If the Company should not be raising new or additional capital the amount required for these annual allotments is bought in the market.

To induce the employees to save the withdrawable half of the bonus they have the option of leaving it at interest—4 per cent. up to £20, and 3 per cent. over £20—in the Company's hands, but withdrawable at any time on a week's notice, or they can invest it in stock. As stated in the paper, a very large proportion of this part of the bonus is saved.

The agreements are an important part of the system, for by their means discrimination is exercised. This is essential to success. If a profit-sharing bonus is given indiscriminately to all workmen, good, bad and indifferent, it may very soon lose its effect as a stimulus to good work. Workmen who are careless and indifferent about their work are therefore told when their agreement expires that it will not be renewed until they show more interest in their work, and that they can apply again in three months. If they have improved, an agreement for perhaps three months is given, to be renewed if they continue to work satisfactorily. This system of agreements giving security for twelve months' work is greatly valued by the regular workmen, while those employed in the winter only have agreements for shorter terms, thus bringing them also into the partnership. The granting or refusing agreements is not left to any subordinate official or foreman, but all must come before the chief.

The question was asked at the meeting, Where does the money come from to pay the bonus? which last year amounted to £25,660 in the case of the South Metropolitan Company.

It is undoubtedly produced by the better working of the employees generally. This is proved by a comparison with the wages accounts of companies where the system is not in force, the rates of wages being the same, but the cost per ton of coal handled is considerably less.

The system is, therefore, beneficial to both employer and employed. It was introduced with the double object of attaching the men to the Company and of enabling them to improve their position in life. If the bonus were distributed annually in cash nearly all would be spent and little permanent good would result to the workmen; their interest in the partnership would gradually weaken and in time disappear. The partnership was made complete in 1898, when the two workmen directors were elected by the shareholding workmen. They share equally with the other directors in the control of the Company, with credit to themselves and to the general advantage. The workmen have responded in the right spirit, and have shown themselves to be quite ready and willing to accept losses. Twice since 1889 has the price of gas been considerably increased, necessitated by the great rise in the price of coal. Consequently in 1892 the bonus fell from 5 to 3 per cent., and in 1900 it dropped from 9 per cent. to nothing, and started again at $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. in 1901, rising to $7\frac{1}{2}$ in 1902. The men accepted the position cheerfully; they knew the cause, and maintained their confidence in their employers, and relaxed none of their interest in the Company, hoping for a return of prosperity.

The Crystal Palace District Gas Company adopted a profit-sharing system in 1894 on the same principle as that of the South Metropolitan Company, and with equal success. Rather more than 500 employees are participators, and now possess in the ordinary stock of the Company and on deposit at interest over £16,000, or an average of more than £30 per man, the accumulations of nine years. They, like the South Metropolitan men, have had good and bad times, and have taken the latter quite as well as their neighbours, but the

consummation of workmen directors will not be reached until next year. At the Commercial Gas Company of London a start was only made in 1901, on identical lines, when an immediate and striking change took place in the bearing and conduct of the workmen towards the management, and every thing promises as well as at the other two Companies.

There is, in fact, no reason but want of will why this system of co-partnership of shareholders, employees, and consumers should not be extended to every Gas Company in the kingdom. If there were the will why should not the principle, modified to meet varying conditions and circumstances, be adapted to a multitude of industries sadly in need of such a bond of union and strength ?

G. L.

XI

APPRENTICESHIP IN RELATION TO THE UNEMPLOYED

During the past winter general attention was once more attracted to the 'problem of the unemployed.' Reflection and inquiry have recently shown, as they always do show, that the causes of the evil are complex and far-reaching; that there is no one remedy easy of application. Former experience warns us that with this disappointing conviction public interest is likely to flag, and the subject to be neglected, till the next hard winter or industrial depression brings it again to the fore. Yet no one can say that the state of things exhibited by the 'unemployed' of last winter is inevitable. On the contrary, the evil is in its nature curable. Because its cure is complex, slow, and difficult, it is none the less incumbent upon all patriotic men and women to set it on foot and further it.

It is the purpose of this paper to isolate and consider *one* of the well-recognised causes which produce 'lack of employment'—namely, *Lack of Technical Skill*, and to advocate as a remedy for this *the revival in a modified form of the old system of apprenticeship*.

The remedy is no new idea; it has many and more weighty advocates; and yet it remains untried. We do not think this is because its opponents hold the field, even though they include some well-known economists. We think, rather, it is because the subject, important as it is, has not yet received sufficient attention. The economists alluded to fail

to consider it in all its bearings, but condemn it on too slight a hearing. The general public overlook it.

Apprenticeship was given a bad name and hanged by Adam Smith, who saw it under special circumstances, and his followers have inveighed against it ever since. Laymen look upon it as obsolete on their authority. The system these writers condemn is one involving restriction of liberty, injustice, oppression, and lack of adaptability to changing conditions of industry.

But these objectionable features are not inherent in the contract of apprenticeship. They are the results of unwise trade regulations, or undesirable trade customs associated with, but incidental to, that contract.

It is worthy of note that not even the opponents of apprenticeship have been able to suggest a satisfactory substitute for it as a means of craft training. It might be revived in a form which is free from the disadvantages referred to, and by its revival a great improvement might be effected in the technical skill of workmen of all sorts, and that in an easy and natural way involving no expenditure and little new machinery.

If we look closely at *the Unemployed of London* on any one day, we discern several grades. First we will set aside those who are physically or morally unfitted for continuous work—of a more arduous kind than marching in street processions. These form a serious problem, but its solution is not to be sought in better technical training. We will also set aside the varying number of skilled workmen who are temporarily out of work from one reason or another. These men, for the most part, have solved the problem in their own case by thrift. There remain *two distinct classes of the unemployed.*

(1) First, men who pursue the less skilled industries. General labourers and labourers auxiliary to some definite trade; carmen and porters of all sorts.

To these must be added clerks and warehousemen.

For the first of these groups, the special skill needed is quickly or easily acquired; for the second, it is acquired in the higher standards of the elementary schools at no cost to the parents.

(2) Secondly, so called 'wasters.' Men who practise a skilled trade which they have only imperfectly mastered. They cannot join their trades' unions, for they are not competent to earn the minimum rates of wages fixed by those bodies.

Looking more closely at these two classes, we see that *for the workers in the first there is a demand.* As with the demand for skilled mechanics, this varies with the conditions of each particular trade and of trade in general. The chief cause of lack of employment in this class is the *excessive supply of labour.* The fact hardly needs demonstration. Experience shows us that a man on the wrong side of forty, who loses his berth through sheer ill fortune, may remain out of work, even though he be intelligent, trustworthy, and have had a good general education.

No employer advertises for a qualified clerk, for he would have half London besieging his office for the post.

A gentleman who advertised for a coachman—it was before the reservists had come back—told me that he had two hundred applications in two days.

At the Fulham Labour Bureau, during the week ending February 13 last, 230 men applied for work. Of these 171, or about 74 per cent., belonged to this class.

We submit, then, the urgency of diminishing the supply of unskilled and clerical labour by diverting young boys to the more skilled industries.

For the workers in the second class as such there is no demand. No one who had a choice would employ a man who did his work badly. The existence of this class is generally admitted to be an evil, and in London a grave and increasing evil.

It was felt to be so serious in the building trades, that the Technical Education Board of the London County Council,

in 1897, appointed a sub-committee to inquire into the 'educational requirements' of members of these trades. The committee reported in 1899, and the burden of their report is applicable to other trades. They inquired to what was due the lack of skill amongst workmen, so generally complained of by architects. They found it was due to the absence of any method of learning the trades thoroughly. Such a method they agreed cannot be supplied by technical classes *alone*, however efficiently conducted. Technical education authorities are the first to admit this fact.

Most of the twenty-nine witnesses examined by the sub-committee advocated the re-introduction of the apprenticeship system, which still obtains throughout the trades in Scotland and to a considerable extent in the provinces.

The system has not so completely died out even in London as is sometimes assumed, and we may here notice *cases of its survival or revival.*

Amongst London compositors it is the rule, though there are probably numerous exceptions. Indentured apprenticeship is the professed qualification for admission into the union, which includes at least 75 per cent. of those in the trade.

It is also common in the other skilled branches of the printing trade, in the book-binding and kindred trades, and in the smaller industries of basket-making, brush-making, coopering and silk-hat making.

It is frequently met with in various other trades, such as the tobacco industries, coach-building, and gold and silver smithing. Moreover, it is important to observe that in the very industries in which it has fallen into general disuse *individual employers* are to be met with who practise it, and that admittedly not from any philanthropic motive, but because, looking further ahead than their fellow-employers, they consider it pays them in the long run. The firm of Messrs. Holloway Bros. is an instance in the building trades; the Government dockyards, Messrs. Yarrow, and

Messrs. Humphrey & Tennant are instances in the shipbuilding and engineering trades.

Amongst small employers it is frequent in these trades—the trades, that is, where it is reported non-existent. The Jewish Board of Guardians has at present twenty boys apprenticed to electrical and fifteen to mechanical engineering.

There would seem to be, then, enough *primâ facie* evidence of the practicability of apprenticeship to justify further inquiry on the subject. We will accordingly glance at *the history of the system*, for possibly much prevalent misunderstanding of it is due to the historical associations of the word.

Apprenticeship in the Middle Ages was an essential part of the guild system, under which industry was effectively organised and regulated, roughly speaking, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries. The aim of the guilds was to maintain the standard of quality of the goods produced, and the standard of life of the craftsman. This was attained by the enforcement of apprenticeship as a means of entrance to the trade, as well as by inspection of goods and regulation of prices. The only exception to apprenticeship was in the case of a father teaching his son his own trade, when a binding form of indenture was not as a rule used, the interest of the father to train his son properly being held sufficient security. Antagonism between capital and labour was in the Middle Ages practically non-existent. The apprentice lived under his master's roof. His master stood *in loco parentis* to him during his term of servitude, and was responsible alike for his moral as for his craft training. Division of labour was very little known, and a craftsman had to carry through all the processes of manufacture himself. To qualify himself for this in each trade he was bound for not less than seven years.

The sixteenth century saw the decay of the guild system as an effective institution, but the ideals for which the guilds had striven were still recognised, and the means by which

they had sought to attain them adopted, viz. the maintenance of the quality of output by apprenticeship and inspection.

In spite of their restrictive regulations the guilds had proved themselves incapable of entirely excluding 'unlawful men' from the exercise of their trades, and they had followed the mistaken policy of making their regulations against outsiders more narrow and restrictive, instead of attempting to modify them in accordance with the needs of the times. Not only was there a considerable influx of foreign artizans during the sixteenth century, but the hired servants or labourers began to creep into the trade as it were by the back door. The opposition shown to this class was undoubtedly a hardship, and involved a certain economic loss to the community, but it is doubtful whether the class existed to any considerable extent, except in those trades where capital and the division of labour first appeared, as for instance in the West of England clothing trade. In these as soon as division of labour was introduced it became manifest not only that a seven years' apprenticeship was not in all cases necessary, but that it would be impossible to enforce it. Towards the close of the eighteenth century the introduction of machinery, growth of the capitalist class, and increased division of labour, revolutionised industrial methods. Not all trades were equally affected, but the greatest change was wrought in the chief industry of the country, namely, the textile. The old kind of apprenticeship was no longer suited to this trade, but the famous Act of Elizabeth enforcing it was unrepealed till 1814, and convictions under the Act became very numerous. This attempt to enforce the system where it was no longer suitable brought it into disrepute, and the legal interpretation of the statute rendered possible manifold hardships and inconsistencies. Not infrequently the new capitalist employer took unjust advantage of the Act. The mill-owner, for instance, no longer wanted skilled workmen capable of carrying out all the processes of manufacture; he needed a

vast number of 'hands' as auxiliaries to his new machines, each performing one small monotonous process. To obtain these hands as cheap as possible he resorted to child-labour on a large scale. The workers were frequently forced, by threat of dismissal and the loss of their now reduced wages, to put their children to the mills, bound by a one-sided agreement to the benefit of the master. The child-labour of the mills was also largely recruited by the parish apprentices, sent in scores at the age of six and upwards, chiefly from London but also from other large towns, bound by the Guardians under the Statute 43 Elizabeth 'for the relief of the poor.' Thousands of hapless London children were thus sent into virtual slavery among strangers, to supply the needs of the northern mill-owners, and not a soul concerned himself in their welfare. Small wonder that when this abomination was put an end to, the system of apprenticeship proper never revived in these trades, and that ill odour clung to the word. Except in these trades, however, and in those new industries, such as engineering, which were springing out of the new order, apprenticeship was still very largely the custom at the close of the eighteenth century, and it has survived more or less continuously to the present day. To turn to our own times, as has been seen it is to be found existing to some extent in most industries, even in those where division of labour is carried furthest. But it has ceased to be the rule.

Modern apprenticeship is, however, very different from that we have been reviewing. The boy is nearly always an *out*-apprentice, living at home and going daily to work. This fact alone fundamentally alters the relation between apprentice and master. The out-apprentice is, in fact, a new production, adapted to new conditions of industry. What gives the impression that he is an anachronism is that his deed of binding is, more often than not, a replica of that used in Elizabeth's time or even earlier. Many of its provisions are now inapplicable, while its wording is unintelligible to

the boy bound by it. The reason it survives (besides the reluctance of laymen to tamper with the law) is that the essential part of modern apprenticeship is unchanged and is embodied in it, for the essence of apprenticeship is that *it is a contract enforceable at law, between the master, on the one hand, to teach or have taught, and the boy, on the other hand, to serve.* All else is incidental. There may or may not be a premium to pay. The duration of apprenticeship may be anything from one year to seven. The boy may serve all his time with one master, or provision may be made for him to serve several in succession. He may have no wages, or very small ones, the first year, or he may start with from 6*s.* to 10*s.* a week. What *is* fixed is that he cannot change his trade or employer without the consent of that employer, while his employer cannot get rid of him or have him taught less than thoroughly.

As to the hardship to the boy involved in his condition of servitude, this is practically no greater than that endured by every public schoolboy at a corresponding age. His parents select a school, well or ill, and the boy is practically bound to stay there and obey his masters whether he likes it or not. Who can question the great advantage to the boy of the moral discipline of apprenticeship where a wise selection of a firm is made? The mere existence of an indenture will not, of course, secure that the apprentice is turned out a skilled workman. A trade must be selected which the boy is capable of acquiring, and a master competent to have him properly instructed.

Granted these conditions, it lies in the boy's own power and that of his guardians to secure that he become a skilled workman and no 'waster.'

But even if the apprenticeship system were full of drawbacks, the question would remain whether it is not by far the best system of training at present obtainable or devisable.

Let us examine *the actual alternatives to apprenticeship.*

1. First, there is the system of '*picking up a trade.*

Among the hosts of auxiliary labourers in certain trades (but by no means in all) the specially industrious or clever or fortunate may learn the trade. The plumber's or bricklayer's labourer does occasionally rise to be a plumber or a bricklayer. Where technical classes admit him, he is helped to rise by their means. Unfortunately, the men who thus rise have not often a thorough knowledge of their trade, and it is not mere class prejudice which makes trades' union officials try so hard to do away with this ladder between labourers and mechanics.

2. Then there is the system of '*regulated progression*' in some trades, described by Mr. Sidney Webb. In certain industries in a very large firm the processes of manufacture may be graded in difficulty and the wages of the workmen correspondingly graded. A regular system may exist in the firm of promotion from one grade to another. Theoretically all enter alike at the lowest grade, and each is promoted or not, according to ability. Mr. Webb compares the system to that of promotion in the Civil Service. Where it exists and is impartially carried out it would seem to be unexceptionable; but it is obvious that it cannot exist to any very large extent. The manufacture of most things does not lend itself to this gradation in the difficulty of processes. Moreover, where it does, what is to ensure the promotion of the averagely competent boy unless it be a deed of apprenticeship? It will always pay an employer to promote exceptional ability. For the boy possessing it all that is needed is the chance of promotion. Put him into a large progressive firm of any sort, and he is safe to make his way upwards without indentures. But for the average boy the case is different.

3. Thirdly, there is the right prevailing in certain trades of the father to introduce his own son. This is good so far as it goes; but as with the mediæval system of apprenticeship, when the right is made *exclusive* it involves a hardship to outsiders and an economic loss of talent to the community in this case simply because craft skill is not hereditary.

4. Lastly, there is by far the most usual, and hence the most important, system, the *system of learners*. It is the learner who has taken the place of the old apprentice. He usually starts as an errand-boy in a firm where a skilled trade is carried on. Every ambitious errand-boy is fired by his employer's suggestion that if he gives satisfaction he will learn the trade. As a rule, however, it is only the sharpest of these lads, or those who have some private interest, who are put to the bench. The rest become unskilled labourers. How much trade skill the learner acquires will depend upon his own character and that of the trade, the particular house, the manager, and the foreman. There are a few trades, such as silversmithing, which it does not pay the master to have the boy taught less than thoroughly. There are many, such as cabinet-making or engineering, where it may pay the master to keep the boy to some one small branch of the trade—some easy process which a boy soon learns to do as well as a man while drawing boy's wages. There is, then, no method about this system of training. It is largely a matter of luck. The boy may any day lose his place through no fault of his own. He may never get the chance to learn important processes. If he does, he is tempted by higher wages to leave off learning and start as a 'hand' in one branch of the trade before he has mastered its other branches. The danger is very great that the 'learner' of only average intelligence and luck becomes the incompetent workman.

To wind up with, we will venture to discuss some of the current *objections to apprenticeship*.

As we stated at the outset, we think that the objections raised by writers on economics are mostly beside the mark. Throughout their discussion of the subject they assume that alongside with apprenticeship there must be rules: (1) Unduly restricting the proportion of apprentices to journeymen in a trade; and (2) restricting the entrance to a trade to indentured apprentices. These restrictions existed under the Act of Elizabeth, and it was natural that Adam Smith and

thinkers of his generation, smarting under the abuses of this Act, should not distinguish them from its uses.

(1) One objection raised against apprenticeship in London, in certain trades, is that such minute division of labour exists here that it is impossible for a lad to receive an all-round training in one house. This objection can be met by arranging for the apprentice to serve under different masters in succession, with one indenture, and so learn the different branches and methods in the trade.

But the most serious objections on both sides are, we think, to be met by *local apprenticeship societies.* Such are the Apprenticeship Committee of the Jewish Board of Guardians and the East End Apprenticeship Fund, and, starting as a young and humble imitator of these two societies, our own Apprenticeship Committee at the Women's University Settlement. A body of this sort acts as an impartial third party to the indenture, anxious to meet the wishes of the employer, anxious to do well by the boy; with discretionary power to settle disputes, and if need be, to cancel the indenture. (2) The existence of such a body is found to meet the objection commonly raised by the employer, that the apprentice is likely to be a nuisance and unamenable to discipline. (3) It also meets the objection raised on behalf of the apprentice that he cannot, in fact, ensure that he is properly taught the trade.

If such a body have funds at its disposal wherewith to lend premiums, the following grave objections are removed:—

(4) On the employer's side, that apprentices are an undue expense to the firm, seeing that they take up valuable space and the time of a skilled mechanic. In many trades, it is further argued that the expense is unnecessary because workmen can be got who have learned the trade thoroughly in the provinces.

(5) On the apprentice's side, that his family cannot afford the small wages during the earlier years of apprenticeship.

It must be admitted that, from a short-sighted point of view, the employer's objection is unanswerable—that apprenticeship, even where there is a premium, does not pay. Especially where the subdivision of labour is great, it pays him better to select the most promising of his errand-boys, to put a very few of them through the trade (to become foremen), and to turn the rest on to minute and mechanical subdivisions of the work, trusting to a supply of all-round men from the country to fill any gaps which may occur. But we submit that this view, though unanswerable so far as it goes, *is* short-sighted.

The action of an employer who holds it has two results, which tend to depress industry in general and must in the long run react upon his own trade and his own firm.

First, it induces a flow of the best blood from the provinces, which in a couple of generations is seen to deteriorate.

Secondly, it floods the labour market with semi-skilled craftsmen.

He might well give consideration to the opinion of other employers, who, like Mr. Holloway, find that apprenticeship pays them in the end, because their apprentices become good mechanics and usually remain in the firm's employ; or who, like the Government dockyards, turn out from amongst their apprentices 'men who take the highest professional position in the country' in their own trade. The main objection from the side of parents of apprentices is also a short-sighted one. It is an exercise of thrift for which they may never directly reap the benefit, when poor parents put their son to a good trade, starting with 3*s.* 6*d.* a week, instead of making him a vanguard at 8*s.* or 9*s.*, or an office-boy at 9*s.* or 10*s.*

It is not, however, working-class parents, and still less is it trades' union officials, who need conversion on the subject of apprenticeship. There are thousands of parents who would be ready to take advantage of it for their sons and daughters, while trade unionists are amongst its strongest

advocates. The opposition which has hitherto prevented its revival comes from the large class of employers, who, with notable exceptions, pursue a policy in this matter of training their employees which is both short-sighted and unpatriotic.

The hope for modern apprenticeship is not that it may be forced on employers by strong trades' unions, nor that it may be fostered by 'charity,' but that it may come into fashion from its being generally recognised that in each case its 'ultimate effect on the welfare of the trade and the future of the boy' is beneficial. The habit of looking to the more remote rather than the more immediate effect of action, both on the part of employers and parents, is one that may be expected of them in an increasing degree. To doubt this is to doubt one of the essentials of human progress.

APPENDIX.

The Annual Report of the Jewish Board of Guardians for 1902 shows a total of 251 apprentices bound within the year, as against 218 in 1901. Of these forty-two are girls as against twenty-five in 1901. These were bound to eighty-three different trades.

The East End Apprenticeship Fund since it started fourteen years ago has apprenticed 640 boys and girls. About forty are bound each year.

The Apprenticeship Committee of the Women's University Settlement started seven years ago for the purpose of apprenticing physically defective children and children of widows. In March 1903, its scope was extended to all children needing help of the kind and living within or attending schools within the district; twenty-nine children have been apprenticed, of whom four were deaf mutes, seven cripples, three very delicate. Besides these thirty have been placed as 'learners,' of whom six were deaf mutes, three blind, ten very delicate, two crippled.

M. K. B. & F. H. D.

XII

WAGES AND HOUSEKEEPING

The difficulty of maintaining a proper equilibrium between an income and the needs it has to meet is, of course, not confined to the wage-earning classes; it is a difficulty which every responsible person must have felt at one time or another. But it assumes its chief importance where failure means failure to provide the necessaries of an effective human life, rather than where it merely means deprivation of luxuries; and that—speaking very generally—is mainly in the case of the wage-earners. It is this point of view which one has in mind in speaking of the sufficiency or otherwise of wages; from another point of view one may of course say that no income is sufficient which leaves a single want unsatisfied, and it is from this latter point of view that we welcome the prospect of any and every rise which the recipients are capable of using advantageously.

The question as to whether wages are sufficient is one which can never be long absent from the consciousness of an industrial community; and wherever there is a class whose income seems obviously inadequate to its needs there will be much anxious questioning as to how the deficiency may be met and equilibrium restored. The friends and advisers of those who have difficulties in making both ends meet, who are 'poor,' will then direct their energies in one of two ways: they may insist mainly upon the importance of increasing this income, or they may strive to inculcate the lesson of cutting down needs until the present income is sufficient to meet them.

It was natural enough that a century or two ago, when the 'iron law' of wages was still accepted, the latter method was most in men's minds. If, as was then thought, it was impossible that there should ever be more than a temporary rise in the rate of wages, then obviously the position of the poor could be improved, and their struggles made easier, only by an increased economy and a reduced scale of wants. The use of wheaten bread, tea-sipping, drunkenness, large families, finery in dress, all were condemned in much the same terms as wasteful and unnecessary. No doubt many lessons of economy were taught, but it was an economy which aimed more at mere restriction than at expansion in the right direction. Then as now model dietaries were drawn up, but with the opposite intention of showing that the normal diet—low as it seems to us—was excessive. It would be interesting to work out Arthur Young's 'Seven days' messes for a stout man' in modern terms of calories, &c.; in price it works out at 3*d.* a day, and in consistency seems wholly inadequate, even to the unscientific eye. And yet the author was a practical farmer of very wide experience, and hardly likely to have been altogether wild in his estimates.

Experience has taught us something during the last century. We have learned from actual facts that wages can rise greatly and can rise permanently; and we have learned also to doubt the expediency of attempting to repress the natural expansion of human wants. Both Irish and Indian famines have taught us, again, that a people whose diet is reduced to the lowest point of simplicity stands in constant danger of a failure of supply which will leave it with no alternative food. Partly for these reasons, there has been a great reaction in our point of view; and we now tend to insist on the necessity of increasing incomes almost to the exclusion of a consideration of wisdom in expenditure. The importance of trade unions and strikes as a means of coercing employers, the possibility of enforcing a national

minimum wage, the desirability of supplementing wages by Poor Law relief, by charities, or by old age pensions: these are the questions which now occupy public attention and interest popular philanthropists; while some writers, if not exactly eminent yet certainly notorious, have gone so far as to execrate thrift as tending to lower wages, and extol excessive drinking as tending to raise them.

Perhaps the time has now come when it is safe to combine the two points of view, and to inquire whether there is not room for improvement in the expenditure of wages, as well as for an increase in wages themselves. Fortunately there have always been large sections of the wage-earners who have not paid too much heed to the views of their friends and advisers, but, meeting their own difficulties as they arose, have steered a middle course and found their own solutions. From them we may learn much in our endeavour to see where the truth lies in this dispute. For the fact remains that notwithstanding philanthropic declamations to the contrary wages *have* proved sufficient, and still do, with respect to the mass of the people, to enable them to make a satisfactory life. How is this done? And how can it be that incomes which seem so inadequate to the middle-class housekeeper or philanthropist yet prove sufficient in the hands of those who earn them?

Before proceeding to consider this we must meet the objector who raises the previous question and maintains that they are obviously and glaringly *not* sufficient; who points to the returns of pauperism and to the flagrant cases of poverty so familiar to those who work in large towns as proof of the insufficiency of wages.

We must, of course, concede at once that in many instances, and notably in the case of unskilled women, wages are still insufficient even to supply the necessaries of an efficient life, though not nearly to the extent popularly supposed. But we also maintain that the more flagrant cases

of poverty, which are generally supposed to be evidence of this, are on the contrary comparatively seldom due to insufficient earnings. In the great majority of these cases a wise economy is all that is needed to remedy the poverty. That this is so seldom realised is due to imperfect observation; it needs the skilled observer to distinguish between the poverty due to insufficient income and that due to unwise economy. Such a skilled observer we find giving evidence before the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland. He is the medical officer to the Glasgow School Board, and quotes the following cases which he has come across in visiting the homes of school defaulters:—

(*a*) Maitland Lane, two apartments in close. Kitchen, two beds, fairly clean. Room said to be damp, contains frame of an old bedstead and some other articles of broken furniture. The floor is littered with small coal. Household consists of husband, who won't work; wife (with a black eye) nursing a baby; girl, fourteen years, who cleans stairs; boy, eleven years (school defaulter), sells newspapers; two younger children at present in hospital with scarlet fever; and a sickly baby in cradle at bedside—seven inmates in all. The wage-earners are the boy and girl. Food—breakfast: tea, bread, and jelly; dinner: 'any scraps the girl picks up after telling her story,' or gets from people whose stairs she cleans; supper (if any): tea, bread, and jelly.

(*b*) Milton Street, two apartments. Kitchen looks to back court, room looks to lane, both dark. Household consists of husband, wages 35*s*. a week; wife, domestic; boy, seventeen years, 6*s*. per week; girl, fifteen years, 2*s*. per week; and four younger children. Food—breakfast: porridge and milk; dinner: bread and milk; supper: broth, beef, and potatoes. (Intemperance.)

(*c*) Soho Street, East End, two apartments, rent 11*s*. per month; furniture, two small tables and stool, mattress in kitchen with bedcover, mattress in corner of room. This is all the furniture. Household: husband and wife and five

children. Eldest boy, twelve years, at school; another boy, ten years, in bed, dirty and naked, with counterpane for only covering, said to take fits. Food—breakfast: porridge and milk; dinner: tea and bread; supper: potatoes, and sometimes with meat. Earnings, 23*s.* weekly.

(*d*) Marshall Street, City. Farmed-out house, one room in close, looks into court, very dark, rent 5*s.* a week. Furniture provided, which consists of table with school form, an ordinary kitchen table, two chairs, two plates, two jelly mugs, two bowls, two tin dish covers, and some broken hyacinth bottles, two pots and one frying-pan, wool mattress, one sheet, two pillows, one thin bed-cover (no blankets). Household: husband and wife, two children; boy, ten, at school; boy, seven, deformed (rickets); wages, 28*s.* per week. (Intemperance.) Food—breakfast: porridge and milk; dinner: potatoes and stew; supper: tea, bread and cheese.

'These cases are cited to show the squalor and discomfort of the homes, the intemperance and improvidence of the parents, and the consequent hardship suffered by the children.' (REPORT, pp. 591-2.)

Now in these cases, which are typical of a large class, the actual or possible incomes are such as in skilful hands are found sufficient to rear healthy families in good conditions; and the question as to where the difference lies becomes of the greatest interest and importance. It is to be found in the wise economy, or good housekeeping, which does not seek to narrow the range of satisfactions, but knows how to distribute the income to the best advantage. In some cases restriction is of course a necessary precedent of this; useless or injurious channels of expenditure must be stopped. Excessive expenditure in drink, which not only tends always to absorb the whole income, but by its injurious effects actually diminishes wage-earning power, is the most striking instance, but it is only one amongst other holes through which the family resources are too often allowed to leak. Betting and gambling are less harmful in their effect upon health, but perhaps

hardly in their effect upon the moral nature. On a small scale, the expenditure by the children upon sweets is analogous to that upon drink, and in its incessant indulgence of an unwholesome craving is a fitting prelude to the continual 'boozing' of later years; certainly the money which might be saved in this direction would go far to supply the milk the children so greatly need. Tea drinking, again, is more of an evil than ever before, inasmuch as it has been substituted for milk in the children's diet, and any remission of taxation which encourages expenditure in this direction will be of very questionable benefit.

To stop the channels of expenditure which are in themselves sheer waste would do much towards improving the sufficiency of wages; but it would not do all. It is in supplying the real needs of the family that the art of good housekeeping consists, and it is an art to which we might well pay more attention in the education of our girls.

Perhaps the first chapter in this art should be that of equalising over long periods an income which is likely to be irregular in payment. The weekly wage has an illusory appearance of regularity, which has much to do with the difficulties of the 'poor.' Their mental horizon tends to be limited to a stretch of seven days, and many feel that they have amply satisfied the claims of providence if they can see their way clear to next Saturday. It would be interesting to know whether the custom which prevails in some places of paying wages at a longer interval—of a fortnight, or a month—is found helpful in enabling the earners to take longer views, or whether they merely find some expedient for forestalling them. Certainly the weekly payment does seem to encourage a 'hand to mouth' way of life amongst the less thoughtful, which is very hard to combat, and which leads to the paradoxical result that many a man will be far more prosperous if he earns 25*s.* a week for 52 weeks than if he can earn the same amount of money by working for only 46 weeks and resting the other six. The habit of short views seems to make

it impossible for him (or his wife) to save for the weeks out of work, and so to enjoy a well-earned holiday instead of sinking into debt and misery.

The worst method of equalising the income is one which is only too easily learned—at any rate in towns. It is that of raising money by pawning articles from the home. As a method of meeting sudden emergencies, something might be said in its favour, though hardly enough to justify it. As a method of meeting current expenditure there is no point of view from which it can be excused, and it may be doubted whether even the publican has done much more than the pawnbroker to add to the mass of chronic poverty. But for his untimely assistance, many would have been forced early in life to learn the art of saving for bad times, and would be in a position of independence, who now pass every winter in piling up a burden of debt for the summer.

Now the elementary lesson of averaging an annual income which is paid weekly, and equalising it over the year, is one which might be taught as easily as any other lesson in arithmetic; and, if taught in its proper context as a part of housekeeping, would be remembered longer than many a less practical sum. As an aid to the practical carrying out of the lesson in real life, nothing more effective than the savings-bank has as yet been devised for the labouring class, where the need is most strong for this provision for bad times. In some of the more highly organised trades the need is better met by effecting what is practically an insurance through the medium of a Trade Union. The advantage of this lies in the fact that a miscalculation of the period of out-of-work becomes less serious. The man who has sufficient in the savings-bank to meet four weeks is in great difficulties if the slack time lasts longer; while the man who is insured in the Union will probably continue to receive some, if only a reduced, benefit.

Against the contingency of ill-health, which is far more incalculable than out-of-work, provision by insurance is more universal; and but for our system of Poor Relief there would

be few working-class households in England where the 'club money' was not a regular item of weekly or monthly expenditure. The sick club to replace the man's earnings, and the provident dispensary to provide medical treatment for the family, are indispensable as instruments for the equalising of income and improving the sufficiency of wages.

The careful housewife, then, if she handles the whole income, will have a certain number of first charges to make upon it weekly before she can proceed to her marketing. There will be the payment necessary to provide for slack times, which may be considerable in any of the more definitely season trades, such as building; and if done by means of the Savings Bank may amount to 2*s.* or 2*s.* 6*d.* a week. Much less will suffice as contribution to a Union giving out-of-work benefit, 7½*d.* a week being about the average contribution taking all trade unions together, and one which covers various other benefits as well. The payment to the Friendly Society will vary according to the standing of the Society and the amount of benefit to be received, but 6*d.* a week for that and 4*d.* a week for the family in the Provident Dispensary is a liberal allowance. When old age benefits have been properly organised another 6*d.* a week will make provision for old age for both man and wife; and the family will then be secure against all the ordinary contingencies of life. And if it is thought that these charges are too burdensome it must be remembered that though the unwise housekeeper will dispense with them she will probably substitute others which will be much more burdensome; the payments necessary to take Sunday clothing out of pawn, payments to the tallyman and to the proprietor of hired furniture, 1*s.* off the back rent, and 6*d.* to an importunate creditor, will reduce the weekly income far more than the modest but regular demands of real foresight; while a few weeks of illness or out of work *un*provided for may drag the family to a depth of debt and misery from which it will never wholly recover.

Other first charges will be the rent and possibly pocket

money and journey money for the man, and then begins the art of a wise expenditure of the balance.

With regard to food the first and best economy will lie in the choice of a properly nourishing diet. But it is to be feared that the tradition of a wise diet has been largely lost, at any rate in the towns; and in so far as this is the case it will have to be definitely learned again as a branch of the art of housekeeping. The immensely greater variety of food offered to the people, together with greater facilities of expenditure, has naturally tempted them away from the monotony of what was perhaps a more nutritious diet; with the result that many of them now, when they drift into poverty, rely for their staple food upon articles which should be merely accessories.

As illustrating this greater variety open to even the poorest wage-earners to-day, I may refer to two budgets which I have already quoted elsewhere. The first is that of an agricultural labourer in Monmouth, taken from Sir F. Eden's 'State of the Poor' (1797), from which it appears that of the £25. a year which the man says he receives, or the £30. 14*s*. which he expends, no less than £23. 8*s*. goes in bread alone. Of his total expenditure, 89 per cent. goes in food, and his articles of food fall under six headings only. With this compare one of the budgets from the collection made by the Economic Club, that of an agricultural labourer living in Somerset. Out of an income of 15*s*. a week available for housekeeping, nearly 5*s*. a week is in excess of actual expenditure. Of this expenditure only 48 per cent. is spent on food, and this food is of no less than fifteen kinds.

Of course the greater variety is all to the good, so long as the temptation is resisted to let the more nutritious food drop out in favour of something more tasty. But it demands greater skill in selection and buying, and over and over again we hear, especially from those who work amongst school children, that they get enough to eat, but of the wrong sort—

that the fault lies not in quantity, but in quality. And unfortunately it is an evil which tends to perpetuate itself. Children who have become accustomed to a wrong diet are only too likely to continue it through life, and to hand it on to the next generation, unless decided steps are taken to break the tradition and to counteract the temptation by definite teaching.

The next step lies in wise marketing, and in order to this it is necessary that there should be a good supply of wholesome food forthcoming at moderate prices. With regard to most articles of food there is in the towns little to complain of now; perhaps the one exception, certainly the most important, is the milk supply. In some towns the municipal authorities are taking up the question with great vigour; and in Copenhagen and New York they are said to be successful in securing that the milk offered for sale is unadulterated and untainted (see appendix in Rowntree's 'Poverty,' and an article on the milk supply in the August number of the *New Liberal Review*). But it probably remains for the Co-operative Society to add this to the number of problems for which it has already found solution. Already the larger stores are undertaking to distribute milk to their members, and may probably be trusted to secure its purity.

But even with good supplies at hand, there are in the towns two great temptations, cheapness on the one hand, and credit on the other, which the housewife has to learn to resist; to be willing to pay a good cash price for a good article is no mean test of a true economy. A woman with a special talent for marketing may no doubt trust herself to buy cheap; in the London markets most frequented by the working classes good food may be bought at extraordinarily low prices by anyone really skilled in choosing. But the buyer who is less skilled or wise may suffer at the hands of a plausible salesman, or be unable to resist the over-ripe fruit or half-rotten fish which is going for 'next to nothing.' Nevertheless, the

wage-earning consumer benefits on the whole very greatly by a process analogous to the 'dumping' said to be practised in our markets by the foreigner. The surplus of supplies which cannot be sold out at a high price to West-end customers are sold far below cost price in the people's markets, or on the costers' barrows; a process which pays the seller better than lowering the price to his wealthy customers or losing the surplus altogether.

But what is really important for the mass of the consumers is not so much the chance of getting a very good bargain, accompanied by the risk of unwholesome food, as the certainty of getting good articles at a fair price. And even when every facility is present the opportunity may be lost, if, as so often happens, the housewife cannot resist the attractions of credit, and does the bulk of her shopping at the general shop. These general shops are largely responsible for the 'insufficiency' of wages; they are very 'handy,' that is, shopping can be done there at a minimum of trouble; they are used to selling in minute quantities; and they are so numerous, and competition with larger shops is so difficult, that they have to be lavish with credit. But even allowing for the fact that they are constantly failing, changing hands, and swallowing up new capital, it is inevitable that their prices should be high in comparison with the value of their goods. They can themselves only buy in small quantities, for they have seldom any storage room to speak of; they sell in diminutive quantities; they stand out of their money till it suits the customer to pay; and they have to cover the risk of considerable bad debts. The following list of the stock with which one of these shops was started in London is interesting as showing the sort of articles in demand:

Streaky at 7½*d.* and fat end at 6½*d.*, cheese at 6*d.*, margarine at 4½*d.*, butter at 11*d.*, tea at 1*s.* 1*d.* and 1*s.* 3*d.*, half-hundred eggs at 7*s.* 3*d.* the 100; broken biscuits, 'German,' at 5*d.*, beef at 6*d.* 14 yellow (? soap) at 1*s.* 8*d.*, 'Colman,'

white pepper, salt, 'unscented,' soda, blue, Hudson's, Zebra, jam, rice, cabb. (?), starch, egg-powder, baking-powder, new bread, allsorts, toffee, mixed drops, vanilla, gas oil, vinegar.

Now, it is clear that the housewife can, after a fashion, do almost the whole of her provisioning here, and if once she has got into debt she will be expected to do so. But how far from economical her shopping will be may be gathered from the fact that this particular shop is expected to provide from its profits the entire maintenance of a mother and four sturdy little boys, as well as pay a considerable rent. Under such circumstances it may almost be said that wages are spent at a maximum disadvantage.

It would seem that any general improvement in household economy must bring with it the gradual disappearance of the general shop. There are those who would think this greatly to be deprecated; and there is no doubt that the general shop is largely a resource for people who are rather helpless. Very often it is not expected to do more than supplement earnings which would otherwise be inadequate, and it provides light work for many who are incapacitated for anything more arduous. But that it does so at the expense of others, who may be even worse off, was strikingly illustrated in a case where a charitable agency made an allowance of 5*s*. a week to one needy family, in tickets, to be used at a shop kept by another needy family, for whom it wished to secure custom. The first needy family protested after a time on the ground that not only did they get small value for the 5*s*., but the goods purchased were sometimes not eatable; so the allowance was stopped, and the ingenious contrivance for making one 5*s*. serve for two families broke down.

But if the general shop is doomed, by what is it to be replaced? To some extent its place is already being taken by the large grocery stores which enterprising firms are now planting down in working-class quarters; and it is possible that in some towns, especially in the South of England, these

will manage to secure the field and retain it. The large scale upon which they work and advertise, and the brightness of their shops and shop windows, have already won them considerable popularity. But there is always great danger that even the best of them will be driven by competition to questionable methods of maintaining a profit on low prices; and groceries seem to lend themselves peculiarly well to questionable methods. There is one tea in the market bringing a fair price which has won immense popularity through ingenious advertisement, and which is said by experts to be worth only a few pence the pound.

The best substitute for the general shop is doubtless that discovered by the wage-earners themselves—the Co-operative Store; and in the North of England its assistance to them in making the most of their earnings is great. For some reason it does not flourish to the same extent in the South country, and in London, with few exceptions, not at all; partly, no doubt, this is because the Londoner clings to credit, and one of the great merits of the true Co-operative Store is to admit no credit, and partly again it is said that the London working men have less mutual confidence, are more suspicious of one another, than in the North.

The method of the Co-operative Society is too well-known to need long description. It does not aim at underselling the ordinary tradesmen, but it does aim at providing good articles at fair prices, and the profit made at those prices is returned to members of the Society in the form of a dividend on what they have spent. In this way the Society acts as an automatic saving agency for the purchasers, and instead of running into debt as she buys the housewife is accumulating a sum of money which can be turned to account later on. Just how the system works in the particular case may be illustrated by the following account sent me by a North Country friend:—

'My washerwoman, a widow with four children, and a weekly income of £1., has pulled herself and her family

together well since her drunken husband's death. She spends weekly at the E. Co-operative Store :—

Groceries, including baking flour . . .	£0	8	0
Milk	0	1	0
Bread, about	0	0	10
Meat	0	2	6

She reckons thus to spend about £8. a quarter at the stores, and gets a dividend of 2*s*. 9*d*. = £1. 2*s*., which she always spends in coal. She does *not* get her coals at the stores, having "always dealt with so and so," and she believes gets them cheaper. She buys her boots and clothes at the stores, and thinks she gets them strongest and best there. A small neighbouring shop where she gets a little butter occasionally regulates her prices by the stores. She hears occasionally her neighbours say the "beefsteak is dear at the stores," or "butter is a penny more," but she has no complaints. She thinks "you get good stuff." Her boy works at the stores. He got taken on because he was a widow's son, and she a member, and that sort of consideration is often shown to members.'

A member of the same stores, who is active in the management, writes : 'The average dividend in the North of England is 2*s*. 6*d*. in the pound, in the South it is 1*s*. 6*d*. ; of course it is possible to purchase some goods cheaper than at a Co-operative Society, but taking quality into consideration, along with the average weekly purchases of a family, I believe it is a saving of at least 10 per cent. In Sunderland an experiment has been carried on for more than a year, of trying to reach the poorest of the poor. Shops have been opened in the slums, where articles of the best quality are being sold in pennyworths ; so far they are a great success, and it shows that it is possible for societies to sell pure food in small quantities, and also that the very poor can purchase pure food at a cheaper rate than what they have previously paid for much inferior articles.'

In answer to the question whether a working man's wife

can get practically everything she wants at the local store he writes :—

'This depends upon whether the store is a large or a small one. There are many trades that a small society cannot carry on profitably, but most large societies supply almost everything except fish and fresh vegetables; only a few have as yet commenced dealing in these. In some societies there is an arrangement by which they take the surplus stock of vegetables grown by the farm-labourers in the out districts surrounding the store . . . . Out of some 1700 societies I only know of two that deal in alcoholic drink, and these two are small ones.'

A considerable amount of the dividends so easily acquired by the members of Co-operative Societies is allowed by them to accumulate instead of being drawn out, and so the wage-earner becomes in his degree a capitalist. 'The profits of the retail stores last year amounted to £8,682,734, and as the share-capital increased by £1,200,991, it is safe to say that £1,150,000 of this was dividend, the difference being the amount invested by new members. Another large portion is spent upon clothing and furniture, articles which cannot be purchased out of the ordinary weekly wages. Then, again, many members use their dividends to pay off the principal and interest of money borrowed from the Society for the purpose of building houses for themselves. Six and a half millions of money has been lent to members upon 2,900 houses in this way; the interest charged is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., this and a portion of the principal is paid quarterly.'

Here we see how the wage-earners are through their co-operation solving the problems, not only of supplying themselves with food, but also with the more difficult necessaries of clothing and housing. That the housewife should be enabled to meet the heavy demands of boots or clothing or coal out of the money she saves by not dealing at the general shop is no small gain; that her husband should be enabled by his connection with the Society to build himself a house is

still more striking. By this method of expenditure, which builds up the family fortunes on a solid basis of thrift, the wage-earner is not only keeping clear of debt and getting the best return for his wages, he is also gradually diminishing future claims upon those wages, until the time comes when he finds himself living rent free in his own house. As a well-tried and successful means of improving the position of the wage-earners, the Co-operative movement ranks with that of the Friendly Societies; and though good housekeeping is possible without the aid of a Co-operative Society, it can hardly be so straightforward and simple as with it.

H. B.

XIII

THE SEPARATE PAYMENT OF RATES

No apology is required for bringing before a special meeting of the Council of the Charity Organisation Society the question of the separate payment of rates. The Society has on more than one occasion taken an active part in promoting the better housing of the working classes, both in connection with the introduction of the first Artisan Dwellings Act and the establishment of the Mansion House Council on the Dwellings of the Poor, and on other occasions. The question of the separate payment of rates is closely related to the dwellings question; and it is one out of several subjects in regard to which reforms might be made which might lead to a greater feeling of personal and social responsibility on the part of many members of the community. Those who are acquainted with the condition of the dependent classes will readily appreciate how important a factor this is in relation to the prevention of distress and the improvement of the condition of the poor. Large rates are also a heavy tax on the working classes, the ultimate incidence of which they often fail to realise. It was from this point of view that the subject was referred to in a letter addressed to the *Times* last winter, from which I make the following quotation:—

> And we should not oppress the people with taxation. In some districts this is increasing out of all proportion to the increase either of population or of rateable value. Thus in three boroughs

in different parts of London the increase per cent. between 1890–91 and 1899–1900 is as follows:—

	Total Rates	Rateable Value	Population
St. Pancras	+34·2	+13·0	+ 0·4
Poplar	+52·7	+14·6	+ 1·2
Camberwell	+66·7	+21·2	+10·2

This represents in Camberwell an increase of £219,694 on the assessment and of £210,682 on the annual expenditure. In West Ham, with an increase of 47·1 per cent. on the rateable value, the increase of expenditure on 'the relief of the poor and purposes connected therewith' between 1891 and 1900 has been 102 per cent.

These large additions to the rates combined with rising assessments are indeed a grave form of economic oppression. And how they are raising rentals and pushing industries to other districts the people do not realise. They forget that, as increased duties are as far as possible passed on to the consumer, so an increase of 1*s.* in the pound in the rate represents usually an increase of at least 2*d.* or 3*d.* a week on a 5*s.* rental. The remedy lies largely in the collection of the rates from the individual occupant. An increase in the rates will then be expressed definitely as the equivalent of so many pence collected periodically by, or on behalf of, the rate collector. And a sense of responsibility, one of the first safeguards for the good use of means and so against distress, will thus be created.

We know that responsibilities educate people, and that those who shirk responsibilities become uncivilised, like the men who become apes according to Charles Kingsley's theory of inverted Darwinianism. And the economic symbol of civic responsibility is the rate—the financial sacrifice which, under legal obligation, each man makes to remain a member of the community and to promote its common good. To the richer man the amount of the rate may stand for little. To the poorer man it may represent a not inconsiderable deduction from a sparse income. Of

the two the poorer man, therefore, may prove the more scrutinising and careful critic.

It is because a large number of the poorer people pay no rates directly, and do not know what rates they pay indirectly, and hold the civic franchise without realising its responsibilities, that this question of the separate payment of rates is raised.

The process named 'compounding' is recognised and legalised by the Poor Rate Assessment and Collection Act 1869, and it has since been extended to other rates by other Acts.[1] By the Act of 1869 the owner of hereditaments, the rateable value of which does not exceed £20 in the metropolis, £13 in Liverpool, and £10 in Manchester and Birmingham, may agree with the overseers to be liable for the poor rate, payable in respect of them for any term not less than one year, and to pay the poor rate whether his houses or tenements are occupied or not. The agreement has to be approved by the Vestry, now in London the Borough Council, and the owner receives as his commission an abatement of not more than 25 per cent. on the rate which he has to levy.

By Section 4 of the Act the Vestry may compel the owner to compound, allowing him an abatement of 15 per cent., and if he undertakes to pay the rate for tenements occupied and unoccupied alike, an additional abatement of not more than 15 per cent.

The owner has to furnish a list of all the occupiers, and the overseer in making out the poor rate has to enter in the 'occupiers'' column the name of every occupier, whether there is compounding or not. The payment of the rate by the owner is deemed a constructive payment of the rate by the occupier; and the liability of the occupier remains intact. If the owner does not pay he is liable to distraint, and in his default the goods of the occupier are liable 'to be distrained and sold for payment of such rates . . . at any

[1] The method had been previously legalised by 59 Geo. III., c. 12 (1819).

time while such rates remain unpaid by the owner.' Legally, therefore, we do not recognise a non-ratepaying occupier; we recognise only a landlord collector of occupiers' rates.

This compounding system has been extended (1882) to the borough rate and the water rate, and the general district rate under the Public Health Act of 1875, which does not apply to the metropolis. In London we have the poor rate, the general rate (which includes the School Board rate), the sewers rate, consolidated rate, &c.; and to these, by arrangement or by statute, the system of compounding is equally applied.

The amount of property in the metropolis at or under the rateable value of £20 is very large. Thus in 1895-6 it was in Bromley 45 per cent. of the rateable value of the parish; in Bethnal Green, 39; in Mile End New Town, 38; in Bow, 36; in St. George in the East, 27; in Camberwell, 27. In 36 parishes, that is about half the parishes in the metropolis, in varying amounts, 12 to 52 per cent. of the total rateable value consists of houses at or under £20. Or we may measure the amount of the property in bulk according to the rateable value. Thus at Bethnal Green the rateable value of houses and tenements under £20 is £175,365, out of £450,625.[1]

Apart from these properties it must be remembered that compounding is by arrangement now adopted also in the case of tenements of more than £20 rateable value and of flats inhabited by the irresponsible and, from the social point of view—may I call them ?—uncivilised rich.

The object of this paper is to suggest a practicable alternative to compounding as usually enforced; but it is necessary to state what are the advantages and disadvantages of the system according to the statements of skilled witnesses.

[1] See statements submitted to the Royal Commission by Mr. G. L. Gomme, Hon. Clerk to the London County Council. Appendix xxvii. to Vol. I. of the Minutes of Evidence, pp. 238, 283.

In the words of witnesses the advantages may be set out thus:—

At Hull compounding is advocated, 'Because when you have these small properties let for short periods it is very difficult to follow the occupiers and to obtain the rates from them.' [1]

At St. Helens 'a system of assessing owners in some form or other, either with or without composition, or with or without discount,' is 'really essential in the case of the smaller owners of property.' [2]

'In Blackburn the recognised custom, when a tenant goes into a cottage house is that he objects strongly to have to pay any rates himself: he wants to have one payment due for the whole thing; so he pays the landlord the rent, and in the rent is included the rates.' [3]

At Camberwell streets are scheduled according to a scale of abatement 10, 15, 20, 25 per cent. For the worst class of property the abatement is 25 per cent., property 'where it would be quite impossible for us (the Vestry) to collect the rates. I mean the tenants are out and in every week, and we should not have any opportunity of collecting the rates at all. In some cases owners refuse to compound, where they have a very bad class of tenants, and then we have to collect for ourselves; we lose rates by that.' [4]

'As far as West Derby Union is concerned, the abolition of composition would not be advisable at all, because there are thousands of people who make it a sort of point of duty to themselves to go into every new house they see and dirty it and leave it, and the cost of maintaining and keeping it up, papering and repairing, is quite as great in the new property as the old. They will flock to new property to-day, but they will be gone next week or the week after it, having soiled the house.' [5]

At Islington 'a large number of the owners are very desirous that they should be allowed their composition. The Vestry ask the collector what is the nature of the collection: "Do you find that you can get the rates with comparatively little difficulty?" and if the collector says "Yes," they allow no compounding at all, but they collect direct from the tenants. If, on the other hand, the rate collector says "This is very bad property," they would

[1] R. H. Daw, Hull, *Q.* 11631. W. J. Jeeves, St. Helens, *Q.* 1687.
[3] R. S. Fox, Blackburn, *Q.* 1630. [4] C. W. Tagg, Camberwell, *Q.* 18720.
[5] H. P. Cleaver, West Derby, *Q.* 4077.

probably enter into an agreement with the landlord. The average they allow is £15 per cent., in some cases £20.' [1]

Some form of composition, therefore, meets the wishes alike of rating authorities who cannot 'follow the occupiers of small properties and obtain the rates from them,' of occupiers 'who want one payment due for the whole thing'—rent and rates, and of the owners of small properties, and especially of the worst class of property, who may obtain a larger abatement because their property is in a worse condition and their tenants of the more shifty and irresponsible class. An abatement of 25 per cent. may indeed be some consolation to the owner, who may charge comparatively high rents on those who do pay, so as to cover his losses amply. In these circumstances it may well be, as Mr. Vulliamy (Ipswich, *Q.* 7181) says, that 'these compositions operate as a kind of bounty for a particular class of property.'

On the other hand, there are these opinions:—

'In the Borough of Burnley, where there is no compounding, they do quite as well if not better than in the Borough of Nelson, where there is compounding. . . . I can quite understand it may be an advantage in the slums of London, Liverpool, or Manchester, where the tenant perhaps does not even pay his rent, but may go off with the doors or uses a good many of the fixtures as firewood. . . . It tends to greater economy on the part of the governing body, when the occupier pays his own rates and knows the cost of government.' [2]

Of Whitechapel, Mr. Vallance says: 'I have been exercised also as to the fact of the poor, who are the occupiers of compounded tenements, not feeling the pressure of the rates at all, and so being led too readily to have recourse to the Poor Law.' [3]

'The tenants on our estate,' Sir Richard Farrant has stated in regard to Noel Park, 'have hitherto paid their rent to our rent collector, and have never seen any tax collector. The consequence is that they have ceased to take any interest in public affairs. They do not care who represents them, what the rates are, or anything

[1] W. F. Dewey, Islington, *Q.* 13057. [2] J. S. Horn, Burnley, *QQ.* 6873–6878.
[3] W. Vallance, Whitechapel, *Q.* 12848.

at all about the details of local administration. I think the result at Noel Park of the tenants being called upon to pay their rates will be to make them keenly alive to the necessity of economy and of choosing the right representatives.' [1]

'It is essential,' says another speaker, referring to the Victoria Dwellings Association, 'that the people should feel the effect of the rates. Here you have large estates, consisting of 2,000 or 3,000 tenants, who are entirely unaffected by a change in the rates. . . . A man must be led personally to feel the pinch of increased rates. He will feel then a greater interest in municipal work, and he will be able to look upon it, not simply as a matter of what it is desirable to spend, but how it should be spent in the best way.' [2]

In conclusion, the Royal Commission on Local Taxation in their final report write:—

'The system of compounding has been frequently condemned on the ground that those who have the right to vote for the election, or become members, of local authorities entrusted with the raising and expenditure of money derived from the rates, should pay the rates directly themselves.

'We entirely concur in this view, and we think that it is most desirable that all classes of the community should, as far as possible, be made liable to personal payment of rates, in order that they may appreciate directly the effect of economical or extravagant administration.' [1]

Clearly then we have this conclusion: 'Compounding' is socially harmful—injurious to the sense of responsibility in ratepaying and citizenship—and de-civilising. On the other hand, it is convenient to rating authorities, to landlords of poor properties, especially if the property be bad and the abatement large, and to tenants who are constantly on the move or who 'want to have one payment due for the whole thing.' Otherwise it does not appear to be an economical system. A discount of 5 per cent. at Blackburn brings in

[1] Sir Richard Farrant, The Artisans', Labourers' and General Dwellings Company, Limited.

[2] Rev. Sidney Bott, Victoria Dwellings Association.

[3] Final Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, p. 51.

nine-tenths of the borough rate within six months,[1] without the formal compounding required by the Act of 1869 in the case of the poor rate. And as Mr. Cleaver says: 'If the rates go up, the property is in compound: if the rates go down, in many cases the property comes out of compound,' showing that the composition is taken as a compensation for an increased rate.[2]

And there is one other disadvantage. When rates rise, rents are put up. The occupier is thus at the mercy of the landlord. If rates rise 2*d.*, the rent may be put up 3*d.* Accordingly in his own interest the occupier should claim the right of discriminating the rent from the rates.

But there is an alternative to the method of 'compounding,' by which the owner is retained as the collector of rates from the occupiers in his own tenements, but they pay rent and rates separately.

The Croydon Rural District Council adopt this plan in collecting their allotment rents at Mitcham. They give their tenants a receipt distinguishing (*a*) arrears, (*b*) quarter's rent due at ———, 190 , and (*c*) apportioned share of rates, &c., as per certificate. The form used consists of a book with counterfoils for the entry of these items, and receipt forms and certificates (all three numbered alike). The certificate is dated and signed, and certifies the amount due for rates, taxes, and rentcharge on the Mitcham allotments, and what part has been apportioned to the individual occupier, 'which will be added to the rent otherwise payable by you.'

The Governors of the Peabody Donation Fund have adopted another method applicable to artisans' dwellings. They used to pay the rates for their tenants till a few years ago, when the direct payment of rates was adopted. Now they have the two systems in their buildings. In some the rates are paid direct by the tenants to the rate collector; in others the rates and rents are paid each separately to the Governors, for in some buildings the tenants objected to the direct pay-

[1] R. S. Fox, Blackburn, 1510. Q. 4022.

ment of the rates, and the system of separate payment was then introduced.

On this plan the rate for the set of buildings is divided by the number of rooms, the tenants being allowed the whole benefit of the abatement. Thus at Spitalfields the rent and the rate stand thus :—

	Rent	Rates per week
One room	2/1½ to 2/7½	4½*d.*
Two rooms	3/- to 4/9	9*d.*
Three rooms	3/11 to 4/5	1/1

And the following table gives the buildings, the number of tenants, the rate, the rate charged (less allowance), and the charge for the rate per room :—

PEABODY DONATION FUND.

City or Borough Council	Name of Buildings	No. of Tenants	Rate in £	Annual Total (less allowance)	Rooms 1	2	3	4
Westminster (15%)	Pimlico ...	522	7/–	£1,260	4½*d.*,	9*d.*,	1/2,	1/6½
,, ,,	James St. ...	145	6/8	300	4*d.*,	8*d.*,	1/–,	—
,, ,,	O. Pye St....	271	6/8	495	4*d.*,	8*d.*,	1/0½,	—
,, ,,	Orchard St.	393	6/8	800	4½*d.*,	9*d.*,	1/1,	1/5
,, ,,	Bedfordbury	145	6/8	334	4½*d.*,	8½*d.*,	1/1,	1/5
,, ,,	Gt. Wild St.	344	6/8	772	4½*d.*,	9*d.*,	1/1½,	—
Stepney (20%) ...	Shadwell ...	196	10/–	450	4½*d.*,	9½*d.*,	1/2,	—
					+	+	+	
,, ,, ...	Spitalfields	59	7/4	105	4½*d.*,	9*d.*,	1/1,	—
,, ,, ...	Whitechapel	283	7/8	594	4½*d.*,	9*d.*,	1/2,	—
Chelsea ,, ...	Laurence St.	66	7/–	152	5½*d.*,	11*d.*,	1/4,	—
Holborn ,, ...	Herbrand St.	203	*7/9½	511	5½*d.*,	10½*d.*,	1/4,	—
		2,627		£5,773				

*Now 7/4.

The following extract from one of the notices issued by the Fund to the tenants shows how the method is applied :—

The yearly amount to be paid in rates by the Governors (7*s.* in the £ less the compounding allowance), works out as closely as possible to 4½*d.*, 9*d.*, 1*s.* 2*d.* and 1*s.* 6½*d.* a week on the 1, 2, 3 and 4 room tenements respectively.

On and after April 27th, the above proportions of rates will be added to the present weekly rents of the tenements, according to the number of rooms contained therein, the total charge upon your tenement being ..... a week, namely, ... for rent and..... for rates.

Should, however, the rates be further increased, fresh arrangements would have to be made to meet this contingency.

Under the foregoing system of collection, the tenants derive the benefit of the 15 per cent. reduction from the rates accorded to the Governors.

On account of the present rate of 7*s.* in the £ having to be paid as from 1st of April, the Governors will have to make four consecutive monthly collections from the tenants in respect of the amount of rates that will have accrued during the four weeks from that date when the reduced rents were still being paid.

The first collection will take place on Monday, June 1st, to be followed by collections on the first Monday in the months of July, August and September.

On *each* of these dates the additional amount to be paid by you will be.....

Your tenancy can only be continued after Monday, April 27th, on condition that you agree to pay the charges required to meet the amount of the rates in the manner above set forth; and the continuance of your tenancy after April 27th will be treated by the Governors as an acceptance upon your part of this condition.

F. B. CROUCH,
Secretary.

To.....

No.....Block,

Peabody Buildings,

.....

Increases of rates are notified in similar fashion. Thus at Shadwell there has been an increase of 10*d.* in the £ in the rate—equivalent to 1*s.* 8*d.* in the £ in the year. Accordingly it is intimated 'that the addition of ½*d.* per

week per room must be made to the present weekly charge of each tenement.'

In some of these buildings, *e.g.* at Westminster, the direct collection of rates was a simple matter, and the City or Borough Council preferred to collect them direct. The change to separate and weekly payments collected by the Peabody Donation Fund was made to meet the wishes of the occupiers.

To give effect to the system of the separate payment of rates generally, wherever 'compounding' is adopted, it would be necessary to amend the Act of 1869. This might be done by requiring the Borough Council to certify a rate in regard to each tenement, as has been done at Croydon in the case of the Mitcham allotments, and to enter such certified rate against the name of the occupier in the overseer's list; and the owner, if he compounds, might be required to use a receipt similar to the Croydon receipt. Or, as an alternative, the system adopted by the Peabody Trustees might be enforced as suitable for Artisans' Dwellings and such large buildings occupied in tenements.

There may be other methods of separate payment of rates under 'compounding'; but I understand that the two I have described have proved successful. Their utility in cases in which the direct payment of rates might not be feasible, is, I think, obvious. The landlord cannot take advantage of the tenant and raise the rent upon him under the guise of increased rates. The tenant pays separately and with full knowledge his share of the rate—a considerable sum, equivalent sometimes to a large friendly society premium. Knowing what he pays, he may, as a responsible citizen, protest and oppose what he deems to be unnecessary or ill-applied expenditure at the next election and at other times, or yield. He need no longer be 'like dumb-driven cattle.' He may be, if not 'a hero,' at least a Hampden 'in the strife.'

C. S. L.

XIV

POOR LAW REFORM

Popular Government does not necessarily require a large number of local bodies for different purposes within the same area, each elected *ad hoc*, and it is now admitted that the present multiplicity of public bodies is an evil. The reasons for this are, first, that after all there is only a limited number of persons of suitable position and character willing to come forward as candidates; and, secondly, the citizen is apt to grow apathetic in respect of the election of the minor local authorities. The precedent of the recent Education Act may be cited as evidence of the fact that inconvenience admittedly exists. It is therein assumed that the principle of popular election is adequately recognised and represented by the authority vested by that Act in County Councils.

Popular government, moreover, should not be debarred from the advantage of obtaining expert and highly qualified assistance in regard to the more difficult branches of local administration. On the details of such subjects the direct popular vote is not always the most competent to decide. In national matters the majority in Parliament indicates the persons who are called by the Crown to be the executive of the nation, but the popular vote does not directly elect the executive. There are, moreover, large branches of public business over which the direct popular vote exercises very little influence. The selection of judges, the administration of justice generally, foreign affairs, the army and the navy, the currency, are subjects which very wisely are left by the democracy to specially qualified experts.

This state of things has now its analogy in local administration also, and the principle is recognised for the first time in the Education Act, 1902. The question then arises, how far is the analogy applicable to our Poor Law administration? The proposition involved might be stated as follows: It is desirable both that the electorate and also the popularly elected council of first instance, *i.e.*, the County Council—if the expression may be allowed—should recognise that there are complicated branches of public business which require a selected rather than an elected body of administrators. An enlightened democracy should have no difficulty in recognising that the principle of selection has its use in local as well as national administration.

The *first* question then is: Is the administration of the Poor Law one in which the principle of selection might be usefully adopted? Obviously, the first consideration is: Is the principle of election working satisfactorily? The answer is clearly in the negative. Admittedly the best men are not always obtained for this service. The County Councils and the Borough Councils obtain the first choice, and the Poor Law executive, whether guardians in the Town or District Councils in the country, obtain a class of men who are less competent to conduct public business than those who serve on bodies which are deemed more important. Indeed, in urban districts it is often difficult to get the full complement of candidates for this, which is generally regarded as the humblest of the local public authorities.

Secondly.—If we turn to the requirements which ought to be exacted from those who come forward to administer the Poor Law, we must admit that a higher intelligence and deeper sense of public duty are required of a Poor Law guardian than from those engaged in any other branch of local business. A Poor Law guardian is not dealing merely with roads and sewers and bricks and mortar, nor is he administering an Education Act on lines strictly laid down by law and supervised by the experts of the Education Board;

he is dealing with the lives and fortunes of the poorest, most ignorant, and most helpless class of the community. He is bound, if he would do justice to his assumed responsibilities, to make himself conversant with the history and theory of the subject. It is a monstrous injustice to the poor that men without any training or qualification should be let loose on them with practically unlimited funds to make experiments at their own caprice. No one would have reason to complain if the authorities elected to administer the Poor Law were composed of persons who had considered the history of the Poor Law, and who, after having weighed the teaching of theory and recorded experiment, conscientiously declined to accept the conclusions which to educated men seem necessarily to follow. That of which we do complain is that the paramount majority do not know that there is any history or any record of theory and experience. This important branch of social therapeutics is in fact committed to an entirely unqualified body of practitioners.

Thirdly.—If we regard the law which has to be administered by these Poor Law authorities, we find that it is most indefinite and most elastic. Within the law and the Orders of the Local Government Board the widest divergences of practice are permissible. (The point need not be laboured here, as the fact is presumably within the knowledge of anyone likely to read this article.) Contradictory extremes cannot all be right, and it is the grossest injustice to the poor that reprehensible methods of alleviating their distress should be allowed to continue with the extraordinary license which at present prevails. This extraordinary divergence of practice is due to the fact that the bodies elected for performing this important public service are as a rule entirely incompetent to select from many alternatives the line of policy most conducive to a satisfactory discharge of their duties. The normal policy of administration is not a policy deliberately chosen, but in ninety-nine out of a hundred cases merely proceeds on the line of least resistance.

Fourthly.—The old adage, beyond controversy a sound one, that representation and taxation should go together, certainly presupposes that the voter shall be aware that he is taxed. As the matter stands, however, the 'compound householder' pays no rates direct, and is quite ignorant of their amount and fluctuations, and yet in many districts his is the determining vote, if he chooses to exercise it. Again, one quarter of the sum spent on the poor is derived from taxes, and in respect of this there is no representation. A very large proportion (something like one-thirteenth of the whole) of the local taxation of the country is paid by the railway companies alone. These, as well as other corporations and companies, have no representation whatsoever.

To sum up. For the service of the administration of the Poor Law we do not get the best men. Yet more than for any other public service we want the best men, both because of the inherent difficulty of the situation and also because of the very wide license which the law allows to the administrator. Moreover, the administrators, as at present elected, are not the representatives of the persons who pay.

The situation seems to demand some different principle of electing the administration. It was originally proposed by Sir E. Chadwick to make the administration of the Poor Law a national service, and to get rid of locally elected administrators, except for purposes of inspection. The charge of maintaining the poor is an 'onerous' one, and therefore, according to current theory, *primâ facie* a national charge; but a national Poor Law has always been resisted on the ground that the administration is, and must be, local—admittedly the notion of a local administration spending national taxes is a preposterous one. We have, however, unconsciously travelled a long way in the direction of a national charge, and a still further distance away from a simple local responsibility.

The time seems opportune, therefore, to discuss the possibility of some new principle of selection. Beyond the

mere question of restoring the just relation between representation and taxation, there are others which require careful consideration in any adjustment of our methods of public relief. The following is an endeavour to note down some of the principal points which must engage the attention of any one attempting to legislate on this difficult subject:—

(1) Public relief includes not only legal relief but voluntary relief, and it is a great misfortune to the interests of the poor that no attempt is made to utilise and co-ordinate our vast system of endowed and voluntary charity in some intelligible co-operation with our Poor Law.

(2) It is necessary, somehow, to have the administration in the hands of persons who are competent to weigh and consider the economic theory and historical experience that relates to the growth and cure of pauperism. It is a public misfortune that for the most part the aid which might be derived from knowledge of this kind is entirely neglected by the normal class of administrator.

(3) It is at the same time necessary that scientific experiment should not be allowed to outrun public opinion, and so produce a reaction.

It was this third consideration probably which prevented his colleagues from accepting the plan of Sir E. Chadwick. The course pursued, however, has had this disadvantage—that it has perpetuated an unscientific treatment of the disease, and the danger of reaction against the very modest reforms which were introduced in 1834 has by no means been avoided. The unscientific treatment keeps the disease alive. It is open to argue that the bolder plan recommended by Sir E. Chadwick would have so largely remedied the disease that the evil would have been reduced to very small dimensions, and there would have been no occasion for popular discontent. This, indeed, seems to be the experience wherever bold schemes of dispauperisation have been adopted. There is in such places much less dissatisfaction than is the case in places where

pauperism is allowed to expand under the encouragement of an ill-considered administration of the law.

How far the timidity which stood in the way of the adoption of Sir E. Chadwick's thorough policy will be allowed to govern the situation to-day it is for politicians to decide. It would, however, be wrong in any discussion of the subject to omit mention of Sir E. Chadwick's plan for the creation of a civil service for the administration of the Poor Law. Its adoption would be attended by difficulties, but, recommended as it has been by such high authority, we hesitate to pronounce it impracticable.

It should be added that Sir E. Chadwick's scheme was advocated not only on the ground that it would get rid of empirical local management, and so result in a diminution of artificially created pauperism, and in a corresponding development of economic independence among the poorer classes, but it was also argued that it would be much more efficient, more particularly in the matter of sanitary and medical relief, and in the matter of contracts and stores much more economical.

A reform in the direction indicated would probably commend itself only to those who were thoroughly convinced of the badness of our present system, and who also had very definite views as to the right measure of reform. Such persons would be a minority, and possibly it may be more hopeful to work towards a better administration through the duly constituted popularly elected bodies.

In this case it is submitted that the popular element would be sufficiently preserved by making the Board of Guardians a sub-committee of a larger body, *e.g.* a Committee of the County Council (with additional nominated members); charitable as opposed to legal effort should be given representation.

The present jurisdiction of the Local Government Board was devised for the purpose of securing emendations of the law and developing the task of dispauperisation along approved lines. It has to a large extent failed because it

has not had its representatives on the local boards. It is impossible for a central board to coerce or guide a body which is impervious to the ideas which govern its policy. The ideas which formerly inspired the central authority, ideas which, roughly speaking, were the ideas of experts, should be given representation on the administrative bodies. There is now a further justification for a large nominated body in view of the contribution from taxes, the vote of the irresponsible compound householder, and the unrepresented position of corporations. It is suggested that these nominations should be in the hands of the Local Government Board. In this way an admininstrative body might be secured which would be competent to grapple in an intelligent manner with the economic problems with which the relief of the poor is surrounded.

This paper is written from the point of view of those who have made a more or less careful study of the question, and who as the result of that study believe in the possibility of a great reformation, a great dispauperisation of the poorer class. Our first object is to get a competent tribunal before whom we can make our suggestions. This we have never had—a view which, in large measure, would be endorsed by the inspectors of the Local Government Board if they were allowed to speak their mind freely.

A step in the desired direction would be taken if the composition of the administrative boards were altered in the manner above suggested.

A few more remarks may now be added, though they are of a nature more suitable for the consideration of an executive relief authority such as that now contemplated than for that of the legislator. On the above hypothesis we are content to leave the choice of the policy to be followed to the decision of a *local* authority. Our argument and contention up to this point is that, as far as possible, pains shall be taken to make the authority a competent one.

The argument that should be placed before every public

body charged with the duty of pauper management is that a policy of dispauperisation is not only desirable, but possible. The history of successful experiments in dispauperisation is on record and well authenticated. There is the reform of 1834, the result of which was that the able-bodied took up responsibilities which previously had been thought beyond his power. This was effected by an Act of the Legislature and by the Orders of the Commissioners, now the Local Government Board. It has been argued that a still larger range of responsibility can at the present time be most beneficially relegated to the able-bodied period of life by a similar policy of restriction in the methods of Poor Law administration. Certain boards have acted on this supposition, and the success of the experiment has been most confidently asserted.

There is no need to go further into the details of these experiments and demonstrations, and they are mentioned here only for the purpose of explaining one of the recommendations already made with regard to the composition of the new boards, which otherwise might be misunderstood.

It was suggested, a few pages back, that representation should be given on the official relief board to the voluntary and endowed charities. The object of this is to facilitate agreement on points of *general* policy between the work of the legal and the voluntary sources of relief. Dispauperisation largely depends on a better understanding and more intelligible division of labour between these two agencies.

The main object of both is to relieve *adequately*, and at the same time to call forth, or at least to discourage as little as possible, the development of competent economic habits and character among the poor. Experience seems to show that this is best effected by placing in front of legal relief an automatic test which will depend not on the caprice of the public authority, but on the willingness of the poor to accept it. Institutional relief is adequate, and it will be accepted only in cases, where its necessity is admitted by the applicant who in

such matters is the only competent judge. Legal relief is regarded as the right of every one who constructively is, or has been, a ratepayer, and indeed, by all inhabitants of the union; and it ought to be fenced with some efficient, impartial, and equitable check. This is provided by the institutional test. No such test can be applied in the case of applicants for relief at their own homes. The decision of guardians can never be quite satisfactory; it will never be accepted by applicants as altogether equitable and impartial. The division of work, therefore, which has been found most serviceable has been one which leaves with the legal authority the responsibility of institutional relief and leaves with the voluntary agencies the task of giving relief at the home of the applicant.

The task of discrimination with regard to applicants for domiciliary relief, to whom no sort of test can be applied, is admittedly very difficult; but the task is easier for a charitable society than for a legal authority drawing its resources from public funds, and for this reason: that the poor do not apply so readily for relief from a voluntary charity as from a State-supported authority, and the moderation of the poor is thus called to the assistance of the administrator. Under this division of labour there is a greater scope for the development of provident and economic effort, and it is on this element and not on either legal or charitable relief that the well-being and progress of the poorer classes must be founded.

In recommending, therefore, that some representation of charitable effort (endowed and voluntary) should be given on the new relief boards, it should be made clear that this is urged in the interest of a *general* understanding only. It has been found a fatal error to allow the Board of Guardians to interfere with the details of the administration of the charitable agencies. If the charitable agencies are simply to register the recommendations of the Board of Guardians, friction is sure to arise, and what is perhaps even more important, the disinclination of the poor to apply for charity

(as opposed to legal relief) is largely removed, and the dis-pauperising influence of the division of work is nullified.

For this reason it is preferable to speak of a division of labour rather than of a co-operation. The charitable agencies must take, within the division assigned to them, a full responsibility, or the arrangement will not work well.

Under such an arrangement, many will be prepared to argue, outdoor relief from the legal authority might with great advantage be entirely abolished. This opinion, however, is not likely to be accepted; and as the present proposal is based on the expectation that, *given a competent local tribunal*, this policy will in time approve itself, it will be enough that it shall advance gradually. Instead, therefore, of the automatic institutional test (which in the judgment of many is the best, because it is absolutely impartial and equal to all), most Boards would probably begin with the test of full investigation. As things are at present constituted, the duty of full investigation by the Relieving Officer, although expressly called for by the Orders of the Local Government Board, is almost universally neglected. Some Boards of Guardians have, by a thorough and real system of investigation, reduced the number of their applicants and their outdoor list almost as much as by the stricter system; but as a rule the investigation which satisfies most boards is entirely perfunctory.

All this would be simple enough and easy of attainment if we had competent administrative bodies, which realised the gravity of the issues, the need of so distributing relief that the development of economic habit and character is not choked and destroyed by the growth of parasitic conditions of life.

To sum up: It is not possible to get the present administrative bodies to depart from their entirely empirical attitude and to seek the aid of science and experience which the difficulty of their task requires.

It is probably foreign to our Constitution to have a great bureaucratic organisation, such as that contemplated by Sir E. Chadwick.

The above suggestion is made with a view of finding a practical compromise.

The great need of the day is the creation of a local Poor Law authority which shall be capable of apprehending, weighing, and applying the experience and arguments of economic experts.

T. M.

XV

A CHARITIES BOARD

Endowed charities have passed through many vicissitudes. They have been encouraged by the Legislature, blessed by religion, bequeathed as a thanksgiving of the dying, or paid as *dona deo*, estate tithes for God and the general good. They have been left for charitable uses out of mean motives, and have been made worthless by stupid conditions. They have been criticised as a cause of social mischief, and vilified as an antiquated nuisance, mismanaged and stolen, shunted aside, schemed for, settled and resettled, fought over and forgotten. Their woes are of a ghostly kind. They are the spiritual relics of the thought of our ancestors—not flesh and blood, nor yet mere property; but gifts which represent the thought of another time and are struggling still to serve men, as, in their several ways, old bridges and buildings, old lime-tree avenues, and the serviceable plants that have travelled to us from plot to plot through a continent, still serve us by the thought of bygone architects and forgotten gardeners. These ancestral transfers we accept as bounties, and receive with admiration and gratitude. But in regard to our ancestral charities we have questions and misgivings. They seem to require of us a spiritual effort, as though they would condemn us, if we are indolent, or have not the wit to use them.

The Charity, indeed, requires that each successive generation of trustees—the givers that give in the donor's place—should continue in some manner his thought, though the

use of his gift be modified. The gift needs the man and this ancestral thought, that it may be re-given rightly as the years pass by. The bridge or the building makes perhaps a similar call on the generation that enjoys it; but it challenges the thought of the generation at intervals only, when restoration is talked of and large repairs are necessary. The personal element in it counts for less. It is for the community: anyone can use it. But the gift is personal—not for anyone, but for individuals who are in some kind of want or are presumed to be so. Thus the gift exiled from the thought of the donor, and not cherished in the thoughts of his successors individually, becomes mere property—hardly that even, for the true owner is lacking—mere stuff and matter, used without invention and managed without responsibility. It has then no natural defenders, and becomes the prey of the avaricious and the idle. Given without responsibility, it creates irresponsibility. It makes pauperism. But if the old thought is good, and is rekindled, or if the old thought is obsolete—or even if the old thought was wrong or mistaken—and men endow the gift with new thought and readapt it to new social ends, the gift is literally reanimated, becomes part and parcel of the younger generation, forwards their enterprises, and prevents their pauperism.

The criticism of the endowed charity, therefore, is largely a criticism of the charity and intelligence of the generation that is making use of it, and the problem of the use and management of these charities is of present importance. However it may be criticised, the instinct to leave charitable bequests and create endowments remains, and is actively at work in our community. The Charity Commissioners state that 'there is reason to think that the latter half of the nineteenth century will stand second, in respect of the greatness and variety of the charities created within its duration, to no other half-century since the Reformation.' [1]

The old—the Elizabethan—view of endowed charities is

[1] Forty-second Report, 1895, p. 17.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not the modern. The Poor Law and the Act regarding Charitable Uses were passed in the same year. It was provided in the former that a surplus on the poor rate—a personal tax in its original form—might be used in aid of charities in the county.[1] Endowed and voluntary charity was supported as an ally of the statutory system, not as an alien and antiquated rival. The Poor Law brought into common committee and conference the new race of overseers and the old race of churchwardens. Neither rate-relief nor voluntary or endowed charity was accepted as sufficient by itself. Each was to have its place.

The history of the Poor Law is in great measure the history of the breach of this contract and of its results, direct and indirect. For there was in the field yet another factor, which had a great influence—the settlement of the rate of wages by magisterial edict. To the wage thus fixed the poor rate served by degrees more and more as a financial supplement; and in the circumstances naturally endowed charity and voluntary charity counted for less and less as the poor rate mounted up and the peasantry of England became a class of subsidised poor. The Unions of the new Poor Law, created at a time when the fortunes of Charity were almost at the lowest ebb, stereotyped the legal system of poor relief. The elected Board of Guardians had no relation to charitable administration. The old compact was treated as obsolete. The parishes and their charities were superseded by the Unions. The divorce of Charity and the Poor Law was complete.

The inutility of the endowed charities considered as mere funds had indeed declared itself before the new Poor Law. Divested of any serious purpose, and filling no definite place

[1] 'For the relief of the poor hospitals of the county, and of those that sustain losses by fire, water, the sea, and other casualties, and to such other charitable purposes, for the relief of the poor, as to the more part of the said Justices of the Peace shall seem convenient.' 43 Eliz., c. 2, § 15 (1601). This clause was, I believe, repealed in the reign of George the Second.

in the social organisation, managed too with little regard to the principles of charitable administration—the knowledge of which was at that time comparatively slight and vague, the charities had in great measure lost their potency for good. The very property itself did not escape from the pilferer and the grabber. Much was lost; while at the same time, in a spirit that might easily lend itself to the temptations of alienation, managers often considered the administration of their trusts a private charge and treated with indignation any demand for information—a state of feeling that has not wholly passed away even now. Thus in the midst of suspicions of pilfering and jobbing and neglect on one side, and on the other an assumption of privilege and of the rights of private control, Lord Brougham's famous investigation was started in 1818 and continued with very great persistency. The main question was the preservation of the property of the charities; the subsidiary question the desirability in the public interest of continuing to apply the income to its original uses. No attempt was made—no attempt could have been made at that time—to give any unity of organisation to the charities, to draw them together as a large and important part of the social resources of the nation. The Charitable Trusts Acts of 1853, 1855 and 1860 [1] mark the limit to which it was then possible to push legislation. Accounts were to be sent in. A staff of inspectors for purposes of inquiry was appointed. Advice might be asked. A most useful system of official trusteeship was created, by which the expenses formerly attaching to the appointment of new trustees was saved, the property of the charity secured, and only the administration of it left to the trustees; and the very useful power of revising the uses of charities formerly exercised only by the Court of Chancery was placed in the hands of the Charity Commissioners—subject, however, to the proviso that the Commissioners could not make a scheme for a charity exceeding £50 a year unless the trustees them-

[1] 16 & 17 Vict. c. 137; 18 & 19 Vict. c. 124; 23 & 24 Vict. c. 136.

selves asked them to do so. This was indeed a strange example of distrustful legislation, ready to expose the smaller fry of charity to the schemes of the innovator, but guarding the bigger fish from any such official interference. So the law still stands. Two important steps, however, have been taken. In the case of the City of London large masses of parochial charities were reorganised by special statute, and ecclesiastical charities were separated from civil charities, a principle afterwards applied to parochial charities under the Local Government Act of 1894 and the Local Government Act of 1899; and, speaking generally, the administration of the civil charities of the vestry, the overseer, and the churchwarden has been placed in the hands of the local authorities, which in the past ten years have been in large measure reorganised. Lastly, it should be added, a new survey of the endowed charities in counties and county boroughs has been commenced, half the expense of which is met by the local authority.[1]

All these things make for organisation. But with the advance of knowledge as to the methods of charity and the general acquisition of greater skill in the care and treatment of persons and families in distress, more should now become possible, I venture to think. At present when schemes have been adopted there is little or no continuous inspection as to their subsequent operation. The staff, no doubt, is wanting, but the need exists. The accounts of charities are furnished

[1] Year by year some 400 or 500 hitherto unreported charities are placed on the 'Unreported Register' of the Charity Commissioners. 'The number of new charities annually created by deed or will and subject wholly or partially to the jurisdiction of the Commissioners averages not less than 500' (Forty-first Report of the Commissioners, 1894, p. 14). On the New Register of Charities required to render their accounts to the Commissioners which was compiled in 1898–1899, and consisted of sixteen large volumes, there were at that time (Forty-sixth Report, p. 12) entries of 70,547 separate charities with certain necessary details in each case. For the support of almshouses and pensioners and for distribution in gifts in money or kind or for the general uses of the poor and available for the relief of the aged poor, there are sums amounting to nearly £1,000,000 a year.

to the Commission, but they are not published, nor is there a sufficient staff to audit them. There is no Year-book of Endowed Charities. No one fulfils for charities a function similar to that of the Registrar in relation to Friendly Societies. And, to turn to local administration, trustees have usually no sufficient means of making inquiry in regard to applicants and verifying their statements. There is no general organisation for such purposes at their disposal, and the charities are not connected with any general system of inquiry and assistance. Help obtained from relatives rarely forms part of the relief of those who receive moneys from an endowment. The gifts from the endowment may indeed, like many other gifts, take the place of help from the family and its members: may become that strange social paradox—a charity that makes people less charitable. There is seldom also any group of almoners and visitors who act for the trustees, care for their beneficiaries, see that their circumstances do not alter for the worse while their income becomes less adequate for their needs, and report systematically about them to the Board. Relatives may die or withdraw their help, and the trustees may not know of it. A pensioner may have long required medical attention or removal to hospital or infirmary, may even die under conditions of the gravest neglect, and there is no visitor to report to them. On the other hand, it is now evident that the alliance of the endowed charity with any active and skilled corps of visitors and almoners attached to a Charity Organisation Committee or some similar body will supplement the work of the trustees and meet these difficulties—difficulties which are recognised and appreciated as knowledge of the methods of charity becomes more general. Many instances may be quoted. Perhaps, as bearing on the reduction of pauperism, that of a widow may be mentioned—assisted to become independent by charity, endowed and voluntary, instead of receiving the allowances of the Poor Law. It is this:—

At a Board of Guardians there was recently a revision of cases

and it was determined to take advantage of the considerable endowments of the borough to take off the rates applicants for whom it seemed possible to make arrangements by which they could support themselves. One of these was a woman of twenty-eight, who had two young children to keep. Her husband was dying in the infirmary, and she became a widow while she was being helped. She received 2*s.* 8*d.* a week in outdoor relief, earned 1*s.* 6*d.* a week by charing, and occupied a room at 3*s.* a week. Her rent was owing; she had clothes in pawn. The family was more than half-starved. She was referred to the Charity Organisation Committee, with which the Trustees of the Endowed Charities were working in co-operation. After preliminary inquiries interim help was given her. It appeared that she was of a rough class but honest and hardworking. 'Could take her glass, but never wasted working time or became drunk.' The Chairman of the Out-relief Committee saw her and told her that if she failed to earn her living through misconduct or slackness she would be offered the workhouse. On the other hand, it was pointed out to her how much she might earn if she were to learn some more skilled work. She accepted the terms and found a place for herself in a laundry as a learner in collar ironing. After inquiries as to the suitability of the place, a small premium was paid for her and an allowance granted till the three months of her training were over. She then earned 10*s.* a week, and, as she gains more experience, she will earn more.

Such methods generally adopted and carefully applied would greatly reduce dependence and pauperism. In this instance the co-operators in charity were the Board of Guardians, the Trustees of the Endowed Charities, and the Charity Organisation Committee, and there can be hardly a question that charity in this instance was much better than the allowance of outdoor relief.

Certainly it has now been proved that, if the old endowment be furnished with new thought, the thought of the new generation, educating itself to become competent in charitable administration, a social agency for good is placed in the hands of the community, the utility of which has not been understood—hardly, it may be, imagined—heretofore.

But there are other charities besides these, located in our

social organisation in the most diverse ways. Some, though voluntary, draw half their income from endowments, and so fall within the province of the Charity Commission. Some are established under Charter from the Crown, some by Statute; some register under the Friendly Societies Acts; some register under the Companies Acts as companies making no profit; some are certified by the Local Government Board; some by the Board of Education. Outside all these circles of legislative enactment there are many charities—homes, hospitals, and associations of every kind—and naturally on the part of some of these there has been a desire to improve their status and to place themselves under legal inspection and protection.

Some very flagrant cases of bogus homes for children and of homes exploited by an advertising founder without any regard for the children's good have come to light from time to time, and stimulate this desire; and recently it has been proposed to place institutions of this kind under the charge of the Home Office; to require of any who wish to establish them to notify the fact within a definite period; to inspect, and to require the managers to send in annual reports and accounts.

The position, then, is this. There is a large mass of miscellaneous endowments, which, on incomplete data, has been estimated as producing for old age pensions, almshouses and doles nearly a million a year, and which probably is now producing more than that sum. There is a large number of charitable institutions to which civil status has been allowed by the most diverse devices, including the extraordinary method of registering them under the Companies Acts. These, though chartered or registered, are not inspected or, practically, supervised in any way. There is also certification in the hands of two departments, the Local Government Board and the Education Office. (I do not refer to the Home Office, which has regard to some groups of charitable institutions, chiefly or at least originally in connection with the prevention and punishment of crime as the

Prison and Reformatory Authority of the nation.) There is an evident desire on the part of some 'Homes' to find a place under the official wing. In connection with the statutory relief of the poor, voluntary charities have of late years been utilised to a much greater extent. In evidence of this I need only cite the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, and the many instances in which afflicted, feeble-minded and other persons are placed in homes established and maintained chiefly from voluntary resources, and paid for in great part by the Guardians out of the rates. At the same time, while the allowance system of outdoor relief seems to many very unsatisfactory, the power of well-directed charity to prevent pauperism is constantly becoming more evident.

There is already in the Charity Commission a Charities Board dealing in definite and useful ways with one large group of charities.

This summary suggests two conclusions, which may be put as questions:

1. If charities are a national resource of social value, is it not desirable that there should be a Charities Board, which would do what the Charity Commissioners now do, but which would also be the registrar and the inspector of all charitable institutions and societies and promote the general administrative unity of the whole? I do not attempt to deal here with the question of the definition of the charities which would come within the scope of such a Board, but the definition does not represent a difficulty too great for solution. Organised under different conditions, but on lines which may prove suggestive to those engaged in charitable work in England, the Charities Boards of many of the United States are of interest in this respect.

Were this suggestion adopted, on the fulfilment of certain conditions voluntary as well as endowed charities would have a recognised status. There is no reason why charities, remaining independent of grants from rates or taxes and

dependent on voluntary resources, contributions, investments, or endowments, should not be brought under a law similar to that which is in force in the case of Friendly Societies.[1] They would thus retain their characteristics of personal endeavour and spontaneity, as Friendly Societies have done, and they would also acquire civil rights subject to inspection and accountancy. The Charitable Trusts Acts *plus* an Act for voluntary charities on the lines of the Friendly Societies Act of 1896, might supply the basis for the change here suggested. As the Friendly Societies Act now stands, indeed, 'Societies for any benevolent or charitable purpose' may be registered under it. But clearly, though such a clause as this may be of service as supplemental in an Act dealing with Friendly Societies, charities, taken as a whole, form naturally quite another and distinct department of thought and work.

Next the question may be asked, whether there should be one Board for England and Wales and subsidiary boards, or what? The suggestion here made is that there should be one Charities Board or Department for England and Wales. Subsidiary Boards might be created, as experience and organisation advanced. The general principle of the City of London Parochial Charities Act 1883 is applicable to other places, where endowments are congested and the population is sparse or has disappeared. Charities harmful in a small district might, under satisfactory conditions, be extended with advantage to a county borough or a county.

2. If associated charity has been shown to be better than the method of statutory outdoor allowances, does not this alternative lie before us: Either to establish by degrees a strong and publicly recognised system of associated charity, to which would be delegated—under whatever conditions might seem best—the treatment of the outdoor poor; or to remodel the present system, so that Poor Law relief by allowances should be very greatly restricted, if not abolished, and asso-

[1] Friendly Societies Act, 1896, 59 and 60 Vict. 1896.

ciated charity should be linked to the statutory system of relief and work either on its behalf or in settled relation to it?

For a generation the problem has been, how can the charitable educate themselves for this service? In this education a definite advance has now been made, and as it proceeds in the large towns at least, the force required for the adoption of one or other of these alternatives should be forthcoming; and thus a change, which would of course entail a reform of the Poor Law, might be made by transition gradually and satisfactorily. If room for variation is allowed, the different towns or boroughs might adopt the new method by degrees, as in Germany the Elberfeld system has been adopted by one town after another. C. S. L.

XVI

A SCHOOL OF SOCIOLOGY

It is always gratifying when an unpopular theory in which one happens to believe begins to find its way into the fold of orthodox doctrine. There are signs that this is the case with a theory which, for more than a generation, has been held in opposition to the cheerful sentimentality of the age, I mean the theory that the impulse to do good may, if untrained, lead straight to evil doing; that the good heart, unschooled by the good head, will probably fall into dangerous paths—in a word, that training is as essential for social service as for other kinds of service. Those who have fought, with faithful pertinacity, to establish this doctrine may at last congratulate themselves that the end of the struggle is in sight. Sensible people, even the people who write in newspapers, are beginning to accept it as a commonplace that some experience and some knowledge are useful adjuncts to the equipment of the reformer and social worker. Guilds are being formed, societies are coming into existence, courses of lectures are being arranged—sometimes even paid for—of which the object is to spread knowledge of the conditions of social life and of methods of social betterment. And all this gives real ground for satisfactions. We have urged that people only need to learn in order to be wise; and it is well that people are at last taking us at our word.

But the moment of success is not seldom the moment of greatest danger. It is well known that the popular acceptance of a new idea involves always the acceptance of all the

error it contains, and the rejection of half its truth. So in this instance we may know that the popular idea of social training will fall far short of what we think necessary—may embrace, indeed, little more than a nodding acquaintance with a few facts of social life, a few theories about plausible remedies, a few generalisations from present experience. Our duty is plain enough; we must

> Burnish the shield, blow on the drowsy coal,
> Raise still the standard higher, chary of praise
> And prodigal of blame—

for ourselves of course first, if afterwards for others.

For, after all, we have been content with a rather limited ideal. We have proclaimed three essentials for the worker and the student, all of them doubtless good and true. First, he must learn the right attitude to his subject-matter; that is to say, he must learn to regard the 'poor' as persons, as members of a society normally related to one another and to him in various ways, and he must learn to understand these normal relationships. To this end we have asked him to read certain books of description and advice written by people who have shown in their own doings the influence of this attitude and this understanding.

Secondly, he must be taught a right estimate of social 'values,' most of all of the relative importance of comfort and character.

And thirdly, he must get a right knowledge of present conditions, at any rate of the localised conditions of the industrial and social life of some one district.

To these essentials have been added some knowledge of the recent history of methods of relief and administration; some acquaintance with the self-guided efforts of the working classes to raise themselves above the common vicissitudes of poverty; and some familiarity with the agencies at work at the present day.

We have said that these essentials are true and good. We

may go further and say that the standard of training involved is good enough for all practical purposes. Well indeed would it be for the community if all its 'helpers' had learned so much.

But from another point of view, it must be urged that the aim is pitched too low. We have thought only of equipping the worker for his work, and the education proposed has been the practical training of a practical age. But it is not now quite adapted to new requirements, new opportunities and new dangers. In the first place, the trained workers of to-day must be more than mere administrators; they must be the apostles of true doctrines, and they must preach in the language of their generation. They may grasp and hold firmly enough the very essence of the principles outlined above, and yet may seem too negative and too old fashioned to make converts. The terms in which our truths are expressed often belong to a past age; have we not all been at times uneasily conscious that the mere appeal to fundamental principles of self-help, independence, thrift, and the like, has lost much of its force, and that these principles must be recast, brought into new connections with current ideas and ways of thinking, clothed in new language? For it is unquestionably true that the present generation is receptive enough, but, as always, demands a new preparation of its food.

Consider too the present opportunities. Within the last decade, a new science has come to the front—the science of social life, or Sociology. Among the teachers and thinkers of all civilised nations it has won its place as a separate (though not yet clearly defined) subject for study. The conservative thought of England still lags behind; but it is significant that the summer of 1903 has seen the establishment in London alone of a Sociological Society, a School of Sociology, and a society for popularising a knowledge of social conditions. This movement (for it deserves the name) offers the opportunity we want. We have faith enough to know that, if the new issues raised are fairly faced and the new avenues of research

fairly followed, the knowledge gained will lead quite surely to truer practice.

But if the present opportunities are full of promise, they are also full of danger. Bearing in mind again the incurable tendency of the popular mind to seize upon the least true portion of any new theory, we see at once—we have unfortunately already seen—the misuse which may be made of some kinds of social inquiry. The subject-matter of the science of course exposes it to the maximum of danger in this respect; and it is only by working unceasingly to preserve the due balance of all its parts that we can hope to counteract false, because one-sided, conclusions.

These considerations might be reinforced by others equally pertinent; but enough has been said to show that there must be some remodelling of our system of teaching, some widening of our horizon, some amplifying of our ideal for the trained worker. The issue then is clear; it is the question whether, and to what extent, the many-sided science of Sociology must be brought into the scheme of education for social work.

But, first, what is the science understood to include? Passing by the vexed questions of its relation to many special sciences, we may assert, with little fear of contradiction, that it embraces four main departments of thought and inquiry. First may be placed Social Science in the special sense, which will include the natural history of society, the analysis of the various physical conditions of social life, the development of national and racial characteristics and habits, &c. From this point of view Sociology is concerned with society as a growth, and aims at the interpretation of the process of social evolution.[1]

The second department is at least equally important,

[1] Under this head would fall part at least of Anthropology, Ethnology, and what has been called Biological Sociology. To some extent also the Social Physics of Comte would correspond, in so far as Society is treated as an ordinary natural phenomenon. But the modern emphasis is undoubtedly laid on the evolutionary process rather than on the mere physical fact.

though less often recognised. It corresponds to what may properly be called Social Philosophy. From this aspect society is regarded less as a natural growth than as an embodiment of ideas or an expression of purpose and will. The inquiry is here no doubt teleological, for it is concerned with the structure of society, not merely as static, but as subservient to some ideal of human life. The natural forces which govern its growth and determine its form are not indeed disregarded; but they become subordinate to the ideal forces, especially the social end-in-view, the development of the fullest spiritual life, regarded as the final cause of the existence of society in any form.[1]

The third department is much more definite and compact. It is concerned, it is true, both with the development and with the structure of society; but in relation to one single group of facts, as determined, that is, solely by economic necessities and satisfactions. Under the name of Social Economics, which fairly indicates both its scope and limitations, the inquiry is directed to the economic framework of social life, and the effect upon all social relationships of economic needs.

The fourth and last department of Social Science is of recent development. Psychology has only lately been added to the list of recognised sciences; but already it has made good its claim to carry very far the explanation of the processes of thought and feeling. Its relation to the problems of social life is not yet clearly defined; but, quite apart from special questions connected with the psychology of social aggregates, little argument is needed to show the immense

[1] That this branch of social inquiry, suggesting as it rightly does the speculations of Plato and Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and a host of theorisers and Utopia-makers, has been discredited by some 'scientific' Sociologists, need not alarm us in the least. Divorced from Sociology in the sense first described, it is exposed to many obvious dangers. But hardly less obvious are the dangers of a scientific Sociology which attempts to explain the whole of social life without any appeal to Social Philosophy.

importance of psychological analysis to the Sociologist. To him, it is true, the structure and functions of the individual brain matter comparatively little; but the social relations among individuals, which alone interest him, are themselves always and only thought-relations and feeling-relations. The social affections—love of family, loyalty to a group; the bases of social action—habit, example, imitation, initiative; the social virtues and dispositions; even character itself, the root of all good and all evil in social being and doing; turn where he will the Sociologist must still look to psychology for the first steps on the road to understanding. Not merely Social Psychology, as it has been called, but psychology in its widest sense has become essential to the student who would know something of the hidden forces of social life.

These then we may take as the four main branches of Social Science. It remains only to illustrate by a few simple examples how each one of them brings its necessary contribution to the equipment of the worker.

It is almost a truism to say that we must know what we want the community or an institution or a person to be before we have any chance of making it that thing, or indeed of doing anything effective with it.[1]

Secondly, it is hardly less a truism that, when we know what we want our material to become, we must also understand the conditions both of its present being and of its becoming. For the understanding of a true ideal will not

[1] It is hardly necessary to illustrate the crying want of this first qualification. Most people's experience is a storehouse of sad examples. But perhaps after all it is not mere ignorance that is the trouble. Knowledge of the truth is there, but it is latent. If forced to answer honestly what are the first essentials for a State, for an institution, and for an individual, most mischief-mongers would eventually answer rightly—freedom and strength. And yet by its actions philanthropy almost universally proclaims an ideal of comfort, or the avoidance of pain, or even enjoyment, in the case of the first and third, and subservience to these ends in the case of the second. But whether the fault lies in ignorance or in that mental indolence which will neither ask nor answer urgent questions, it is still true that the only cure is education.

carry us far in dealing with a single individual unless we know what that individual has it in him to become. But note what is involved. These two simple elements of knowledge must be sought, the one in Social Philosophy, the other in Sociology proper. And more than this: it is not enough that they should be accepted as the given conclusions of this or that science; knowledge so acquired would not stand for a moment before the weakest opposing prejudice; they must be held in connection with part at least of the body of critical and constructive knowledge of which these sciences consist.

Take another example. Underlying any theory of social betterment is the fundamental question of the relation of character to environment. Are we to look for the cause of drunkenness in the ubiquity of the public-house, in the monotony of labour, in the want of wholesome food for the labourers' bodies, or of wholesome interests for their minds, or in some more subtle and far-reaching character weaknesses? The answer to such a question depends upon our knowledge of the relation of thoughts to things: and it must be sought, not in any hasty generalisation from social experience, but in Psychology. For the science of character and habit, ethology, as J. S. Mill called it, lies at the root of Social Science, and is, of course, essentially psychological, depending upon the knowledge of mental processes in response to external stimuli.

Or a third instance. In the politics of the day, municipal and governmental activity plays a leading—for some people the only important—part. But the dangers of hasty socialistic theories are distant and trivial by comparison with the dangers of over-municipalisation. What is the moral? That our administrators must learn, not only the relation of character to law, but the economic effect of the collective expenditure and enterprise on the productive capacity of the individual. In other words, the question must be approached first of all on its economic side—the side now almost universally neglected.

It is easy to multiply instances. Every social 'problem' of the day might be analysed in turn and shown to lead us

back at once to one or all of the departments we have postulated—to Sociology, to Social Philosophy, to Social Economics, and to Psychology.

But here the objection of the practical man will make itself heard. It is one thing—doubtless a good thing—to educate people in the theory of reform, or the principles of social legislation. But to produce the capable administrator is a different matter. The man of theory is not distrusted without reason. What is wanted at the present time is the man of action who knows enough to reject obsolete methods, and to seize upon and to apply the methods which embody sound principles. The course of teaching outlined above is far too likely to produce the doctrinaire reformer, or possibly the philosopher, who—*pace* Plato—is not the best ruler or administrator. Let us admit the force of the objection. It serves to point the moral on which we too would insist. Passing by the advantages which would certainly result from a fuller and more widespread understanding, among educated people, of the science of social life, we will side with the practical man in insisting that there shall be no divorce between practice and theory. The chief value of social education, from our point of view, depends upon its close connection with experience and practical work. The laboratory must be joined to the study; the knowledge of principles which is to illuminate our practice must itself be brought to the test of experience by the learner. In other words, it will not be enough to establish a course of teaching on the lines of a University curriculum leading up to a degree. This is one side, but only one, of the necessary training. In close connection with it must be the practical education, the laboratory work, in so far as the analogy can be applied to work in which, while all our efforts are experimental, wilful experiment is the last thing to be allowed. The student must study the concrete material to be found in existing social conditions. It is doubtful whether this can be done by simple observation; at any rate it will be better done, and without danger, if he is

set to work in some of the simplest and most natural[1] ways under the guidance of an experienced administrator or social worker.

On this union, then, of practical experience with the teaching of theory we must insist, not indeed in deference to the demands of the practical man, but in order to give reality to the learner's studies. As a subject for education, Social Science is exposed to many dangers: by no means the least is the danger that acquaintance with theory may be but the incentive to more theorising. Against this there is no safeguard except contact with actual conditions and facts, with the existing raw material of the science. But there is nothing unreasonable in the faith that, so guarded, the teaching will raise to a higher level the work of the administrator, check the pitiful waste of effort which often passes for philanthropy, and open up opportunities of a social service which shall serve, and not merely encumber, the cause of national well-being.

E. J. U.

[1] By 'natural' we mean, most of all, ways of working which do not involve patronage, but bring the worker into more or less equal relations with his poorer neighbours.

XVII

'IF CITIZENS BE FRIENDS'

As the reader will have noticed, no definite plan, but a general idea, underlies the papers in this book. Of the words 'justice' or 'friendship' or 'love' or 'charity' little use is made. Yet probably the word Charity in its older and fuller signification represents more nearly than any other the motive of the authors. And for those who accept that signification, Charity is not general philanthropy or any of the diverse forms of relief, but a social principle. Accordingly it has a social purpose; it requires a social discipline; it works through sympathy; it depends on science; and in fervency it is religious.

Ultimately society is based on Charity—on love working through the individual and the social life; and social advance depends largely on the ability of the people to realise this principle and to act upon it.

Its first thought is to understand, and to treat with the reverence that comes of understanding, the growing and expanding elements out of which society is formed—the individual, and the family, the groups of members within the community, and the community itself. Its first task is to preserve these in strength and vigour, so that each may fulfil its function for the common good.

In a community much is settled by precedent and routine, but there are points of change and growth which constantly challenge our attention and our intelligence, where the struggle lies between deterioration or advance. On these

points Charity has to concentrate all its efforts to prevent the destruction of the social organism—to ensure that each part shall fulfil its social purpose. Indeed, whether the aim be consciously recognised or not it may be said that the purpose of Charity is social preservation—that the law of preservation in communities is Charity.

The social life implies discipline. This may spring from habits grown almost instinctive and handed down from the past like heirlooms, accepted out of regard for the family, for the better development of individual qualities, and for the good of the whole community. Such are good family traditions in every rank of life. Or the discipline may be newly imposed in order to brace the individual, or the family, or the nation, to a new endeavour. Thus some new law may be passed which would require of each generation of men to make themselves competent defenders of their country in case of invasion. We argue often as if the factors—the individual, the family, and the nation—were separate and acted in isolation. In truth, however, they are but parts and expressions of one social life and have one common interest. And it is out of regard for that common interest that the discipline is accepted. The individual claim is coloured and modified by the claim of the family, and the family in its turn acquires a greater force that it may the better breed and harbour and educate the individual. So, for instance, they would spoil the very organism of society who would distract a mother from her household duties by feeding her children in such a way that she cared less and less to prepare their daily meals for them —letting her become ever less competent to fulfil her duty. Or, to take another instance, equally too would those spoil our social organism who would shrink from the exercise of that salutary though severe discipline which society would impose on its members for such an object as the prevention of overcrowding. Here, as at so many other points where processes of change and development are at work, from the point of view of Charity all are interested and should be brought like a

military body into the field, weekly tenants, leaseholders, landlords, the volunteer forces and the civic functionaries.

Or again, to preserve the organism of society, Charity, with its constant scrutiny of facts and its regard for social efficiency, would modify our system of education on two sides —to ensure that our methods promote real practical skill and ability, and that, no less, our people should understand the responsibilities of social life. And so in other ways.

Because Charity thus claims a social purpose and will not be relegated to the position of a Dorcas, it does not lack sympathy for the individual and for the group. Charity without sympathy cannot exist. Sympathy is the clue by which it is led through the maze—the confusions of cross claims and competing interests—out to the right road. But when the right road has been reached, the logic of sympathy does not leave Charity like a vagrant loitering on a high street. There it sets her to work to meet and ward off distress, and to prevent degradation. Otherwise, it is but imperfect sympathy, the broken clue that does not run from end to end of the path in the maze, but starts and stops, is found and is lost again. And Charity, if she moves on, feeling for this with her hand, suddenly finds herself perplexed, deserted, and hopeless ; and then, as may often be, with one who has ' lost her head,' she falters and fumbles and clutches wildly at any suggestion. Her clue has been but a partial sympathy, largely indifferent to results or else engrossed in some single phase of want.

Thus, if sympathy with the sick were not imperfect, confined to one side or phase of the evils that sickness represents, it could not let patients come for diagnosis and treatment at a hospital, to return to conditions that will inevitably involve yet more and recurrent diagnoses and treatments endless and always ineffective. It would ally itself with other forces to prevent deterioration. But in so far as it is imperfect, it is satisfied ; and the blind lead the blind.

And so with knowledge. If Charity be the principle of

social life, to those who have faith in it, it is of infinite importance to know how things have come to be what they are. If the history of the development of social life is the history of the assumption by the people of new qualities and abilities; if the loss of certain characteristics has meant the destruction of a race or a nation, and the retention of them has been the means of combating economic difficulty and triumphing over degradation, what can be more serviceable than the study of this history? Whatever name we give to the science—Social History, Social Science or Sociology—it opens the way to Charity. It reinforces the power of observation, which is often stimulated for the first time by the responsibilities of practical work, and it gives to practical work patience and a more persistent purpose.

And, at least in one sphere of thought, religion is Charity made fervent. It is humble that they may creep into the lowliest door which sympathy can open, and it is guided by the ideal, the pattern of the good that will be.

C. S. L.

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, New-street Square, London.

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH DAY AND TO $1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY OVERDUE.

AUTO DISC CIRC AUG 03 '94

MAR 17 1938

MAR 18 1969 19

APR 1 '69 -2 AM

LOAN DEPT.

JAN 11 1985

RECEIVED BY

DEC 9 1984

CIRCULATION DEPT.

SEP 02 1994

LD 21-95m-7,'37

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C047778431